GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REGULAR PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
MARCH 13, 2003

+ + + + +

The Regular Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 220, 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice Chairman
JAMES HANNAHAM Commissioner
PETER MAY Commissioner
JOHN PARSONS Commissioner

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO BASTIDA SHARON SANCHEZ

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

KAREN THOMAS
ELLEN McCARTHY
JOEL LAWSON

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

# A-G-E-N-D-A

PAGE
APPLICATION OF LUCY WEBB HAYES
Z.C. CASE NO.: 02-29
Chairperson Mitten 4
PRELIMINARY MATTERS
Alberto Bastida 6
Alberto Bastida 7
Craig Ellis 7
PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION
Craig Ellis 9
Jerry Price 10
GOVERNMENT REPORTS
Report from Office of Planning
Karen Thomas 11
Report from ANC 3D
John Finney 13
PARTIES TESTIFYING IN SUPPORT
Andrew Dean 19
CLOSING REMARKS
Craig Ellis 20
PROPOSED ACTION
Anthony Hood 21
WATERFRONT TEXT AMENDMENT (W-0) OPEN SPACE ZONE
DISTRICT - Z.C. Case NO.: 02-42
Chairperson Mitten 22
OFFICE OF PLANNING PRESENTATION
Joel Lawson 25
Ellen McCarthy 35
GOVERNMENT REPORTS None
National Park Service
Sally Blumenthal45
ANC 6D
Ed Johnson 54
PARTIES TESTIFYING IN SUPPORT
- 7 -
Alan Brangman 72
Alan Brangman 72 William Kirwin 74
William Kirwin 74
William Kirwin

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

# PARTIES TESTIFYING IN OPPOSITION Guy Nolan ..... 87 T. Rodney Oppmann ..... 91 Dean Lindsey ..... 94 Stan Grubaugh ..... 102 Liz Grubaugh ...... 105 Eric Slaughter ..... 107 William Barr ..... 113 Steven Cohn ..... 114 Janet Miles ..... 115 Michael Ellison ..... 117 Will Whitehouse ..... 119 Scott Schramm ..... 121 Bill Ellingsworth ..... 124 Peter Kennedy ..... 126 Marvin Storie ...... 127 Erin McKeon ..... 132 Marian Raup ..... 138 Sam Sharkey ..... 145 Arthur Donahue ..... 146 Pam DeWees ..... 151 Christopher Miller ..... 151 Sharon McKay ...... 155

### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:39 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, March 13, 2003. My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Peter May and James Hannaham, and we expect to be joined by Commissioner John Parsons momentarily.

We have two cases this evening, and there are different rules of procedure for each, so I'll have a separate announcement for each, and we'll take up the Sibley Memorial Hospital case first.

The first hearing this evening is Zoning Commission Case No. 02-29. This is a request by Lucy Webb Hayes National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries doing business as Sibley Memorial Hospital for a Zoning Map Amendment under Chapter 30 of the District of Columbia Zoning Regulations, 11 DCMR, for property known as Square 1448 North, Lot 803.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the <u>D.C. Register</u> on January 17, 2003 and in the <u>Washington Times</u> on January 23, 2003. This hearing,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

the first hearing, will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR section 3022, and those are the procedures for contested cases. Copies of the hearing announcement are available to you and are located on the table near the door.

The order of procedure for the first hearing will be as follows: Preliminary matters followed by the petitioners presentation, reports of other Government agencies, that would include the Office of Planning, the report of the affected ANC, in this case it's ANC 3D, organizations and persons in support, organizations and persons in opposition, and then any rebuttal by the applicant.

The following time constraints will be maintained in the first hearing. The petitioner will have up to 20 minutes, individuals will have three minutes, organizations will have five minutes. The Commission intends to maintain these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be seated.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. Those cards are also on the table near the door. Upon

coming forward to speak to the Commission, please, give both cards to the reporter, who is sitting to our right.

The decision of the Commission in this case must be based on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time. Staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss procedural questions, so you can direct any questions to Mr. Bastida or Ms. Sanchez.

Please, turn off all beepers and cell phones, at this time, so as not to disrupt these proceedings. At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters related to the first case.

## Mr. Bastida?

MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, the applicant didn't post the site until 30 days prior to the hearing. He should have posted it 40 days. were other ways to advise the community that, in fact, this hearing was taking place like the newspaper, the and people within 200 foot Register а radius. Accordingly, the staff request that you waive the rules of the 40 days for advertisement of the hearing.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But it was advertised
2	for 30? It was posted for 30?
3	MR. BASTIDA: It was posted for 30 days
4	prior to the hearing date.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Is there
6	any objection to waiving our rules and proceeding at
7	this time? Okay. Without objection then.
8	MR. BASTIDA: There is a second
9	preliminary matter.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
11	MR. BASTIDA: The applicant has not filed
12	a maintenance of posting. The applicant could address
13	that he has maintained the posting as shown, and then
14	can provide an affidavit attesting to such action.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Would you
16	like to do that, at this time, and, please, identify
17	yourself.
18	MR. ELLIS: Good evening, Madam Chair.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening.
20	MR. ELLIS: And members of the Board. My
21	name is Craig Ellis and I'm counsel for Sibley
22	Hospital. The applicant has maintained the posting as
23	Mr. Bastida has stated. We are more than willing to
24	bring in the

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Affidavit?

1	MR. ELLIS: The affidavit. We could have
2	it in by tomorrow. It was just a mistake that when we
3	were talking, we filed the the posting affidavit,
4	but we forgot to file the maintenance of posting.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
6	MR. ELLIS: So and the individual that
7	maintained it is here this evening, and we also
8	there's a member of the community here that can attest
9	that it was maintained.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. If you could
11	just follow-up with submitting the affidavit tomorrow,
12	that would be great.
13	MR. ELLIS: We will have it down here
14	tomorrow morning.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
16	
	MR. ELLIS: All right.
17	MR. ELLIS: All right. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
17 18	
	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.  Anything else, Mr. Bastida?
18 19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.  Anything else, Mr. Bastida?  MR. BASTIDA: No, that concludes
18 19 20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.  Anything else, Mr. Bastida?  MR. BASTIDA: No, that concludes  preliminary, Madam Chairman.
18 19 20 21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.  Anything else, Mr. Bastida?  MR. BASTIDA: No, that concludes  preliminary, Madam Chairman.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now,

(The witnesses were sworn) MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we're ready to proceed, Mr. Ellis. 5 MR. ELLIS: Madam Chair, the applicant is willing to stand on its papers, unless the Board has 6 any questions for us. We're willing to stand on that. I think it's a very straightforward matter. 8 9 know, in view of the magnitude of the case that's 10 coming behind it, we do not wish to hold this Board up 11 in any way. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. 13 MR. ELLIS: I do have Mr. Price here who 14 is the COO for Sibley. I always get those CEO's and 15 COO's, but who is here and available to answer any questions, if so needed, but if you don't need, we can 16 17 just submit on our papers. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Is that 19 fine with the Commission and we can just ask 20 questions? 21 VICE CHAIR HOOD: Yes, it is fine, Madam Chairman. 22 23 All right. All CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: right. Mr. Hood? 24 25 VICE CHAIR HOOD: Yes, I just wanted to

ask you, Mr. Ellis, this issue about Little Falls Road?

MR. ELLIS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: First, if someone could just point to me where it is, and actually what is it used for? I know it's an easement, but what actually was it being used for? If you could point to me now, and then when you go back to the mike, you can tell me what it was used for.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I have a hand held mike if you would like to use that as you are pointing or you can just point.

MR. ELLIS: Okay. I will have Mr. Price, who can give you -- I know what it's used for, but I'll let Mr. Price, because he has more detail, because he deals with it every day.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.

MR. PRICE: I'm Jerry Price, chief operating officer, of Sibley Hospital. Little Falls Road is a road that cuts through from Delcardia Parkway down to Macarthur Boulevard, and it was property of the Army Corp of Engineers, and so when the hospital purchased the property, we also purchased the road. The road is open to public traffic.

As a matter of fact, the piece of Little

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Falls Road from Delcardia Parkway down to probably
about a third of the way where the heliport is, even
the covenant that we had before this required us to
maintain that. We have maintained and improved the
road over the years. It's available for the community
to use as a cut through, and I know there has been
concern expressed in the community that, you know, at
some time because it is, in effect, a private road
that we would shut it off. We have no intention of
doing that.
It's where all of our employees come and
go for their parking. So it's for our circulation.
It's where all of the ambulance traffic comes and goes
from the hospital.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: So that part of it, that
easement will remain in operation? It will remain?
MR. PRICE: Oh, the Little Falls Road will
remain in operation, correct.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you, Madam
Chair, that's all the questions I have.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Anyone
else, any questions? Okay. Thank you. Then we'll go
to the report from the Office of Planning.
MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Madam
Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Karen Thomas

presenting OP's recommendation for the approval of map amendment for land owned by Sibley Hospital, which is currently unzoned. The application was set down for public hearing on October 28 to request that the Commission consider assigning the R-5-A Zone District to Lot 803, which joins the hospital to the north.

The Board of Zoning Adjustment approved a variance to allow the hospital to extend their oncology wing in Case 16654 in January 2001. This wing encroaches on the land that has been purchased from the U.S. Government. The Office of Planning reviewed the proposed map amendment and concluded that the R-5-A Zone is an appropriate designation, since the proposed use is on restrictions under property consistent with the R-5-A Zone District and the comprehensive plan.

OP also notes that Little Falls Road is kept as a perpetual road easement reserved in the fee disposal of the overall lot, and the parking lot to the east is deed restricted for parking purposes. In conclusion, the Office of Planning recommends approval of the proposed zoning of Lot 803, which extends the zoning of the hospital to its adjoining property. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any

questions for the Office of Planning? This is pretty straightforward, I think, and I think we're ready for Mr. Finney.

MR. FINNEY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to get on the mike, though.

MR. FINNEY: Yes, ma'am. How's that?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's terrific.

MR. FINNEY: Thank you. I come here not in opposition, but seeking clarification of certain points, and I would like to pose them in the way of questions, if I might, of the Sibley lawyer and of Ms. Thomas.

Picking up on the theme that Mr. Hood raised about the Little Falls Road, which incidentally has a very interesting history, it once was the only access to Little Falls from Tenleytown down to the river, and it was a dirt wagon road that originally was listed in the District that was called Washington County, at that point.

Coming the Civil War there was a battery up there, that was the access to Battery Vermont. Then along came the Army engineers and Colonel Meigs, one of the great geniuses of our city, and they bought Delcardia for the waterworks, and in the process they

1	picked up that portion of Little Falls Road. So since
2	the middle of the $19^{th}$ Century, it has been an Army
3	engineered road.
4	When the property was sold to Sibley, in
5	principal, at any rate, the road transferred, the
6	ownership of the road transferred to Sibley. There
7	has been discussion with you by Ms. Thomas of an
8	easement, but I think we should find out what that
9	easement is. Is not the easement just for the Army
10	engineers?
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just to move this
12	thing along, why don't we ask Mr. Price and Mr. Ellis
13	to come and sit at the table?
14	MR. FINNEY: Why not? Yes, sit up here.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then we'll just
16	get this all sorted out quickly.
17	MR. FINNEY: Yes.
18	MR. PRICE: The deed indicates that it is
19	an easement for their access. There is nothing in the
20	deed that says that the road is for public access.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. There's your
22	answer.
23	MR. FINNEY: That's my answer. So that
24	it's only the Army engineers have an easement and
25	right of access to use that road, because they have to

1	get up to property up at the top of the hill. So one
2	of my points of clarification, and I think you've
3	already done it, Mr. Ellis, is to say that Sibley
4	intends to keep that road open to public use, and I
5	would like to get that answer on the record, at this
6	point.
7	MR. ELLIS: Yes.
8	MR. PRICE: I think I already answered
9	that.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
11	MR. PRICE: Swore to that.
12	MR. FINNEY: If so
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's what Mr. Price
14	answered in response to Mr. Hood.
15	MR. ELLIS: Yes.
16	MR. FINNEY: So that is one point of
17	clarification. The second one, I'll try to be brief,
18	is with the addition of this 8.5 acres of land, which
19	they leased up until now. Would Sibley, as a matter
20	of right under R-5-A, is it?
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
22	MR. FINNEY: R-5-A, as a matter of right,
23	be able to put up new structures?
24	MR. ELLIS: You're asking us or you're
25	asking the Board?

1	MR. FINNEY: Well, I'm asking
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Finney, I can
3	answer that. Yes, they have all the rights to use of
4	the property as zoned R-5-A. It's not conditional.
5	MR. FINNEY: All right. Can I ask Mr.
6	Ellis whatever you call it, the FAR now in the 40
7	percent rule, could you build another building on that
8	campus, expanded campus without getting a special
9	exception?
10	MR. ELLIS: Under our present FAR?
11	MR. FINNEY: Yes.
12	MR. ELLIS: We could do additional
13	building on the campus, yes.
14	MR. FINNEY: Could you build a medical
15	office building on the campus without getting a
16	special exception?
17	MR. ELLIS: Depending on the size of the
18	medical office building, we may or we may not be able
19	to. And I'm not trying to
20	MR. FINNEY: I know you're not. I know.
21	MR. ELLIS: box with you, but I mean,
22	that's not right now, that's not a project that's
23	in my office to do anyway.
24	MR. FINNEY: Well, I know that. I'm
25	sorry.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we just have
2	to stick with
3	MR. FINNEY: What I'm trying to get at,
4	Madam Chairman, is this.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
6	MR. FINNEY: That the location of a
7	medical office building there would have significant
8	impact upon the neighborhood.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.
10	MR. FINNEY: And I am trying to establish
11	the point that they can't, just as a matter of right,
12	put in a medical office building, that it's something
13	that the community should be involved in in the
14	ultimate decision.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I believe a
16	medical office building in our R-5-A requires a
17	special exception, yes.
18	MR. ELLIS: It would, yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So that
20	MR. ELLIS: Yes.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be in the
22	future, and you would have an opportunity.
23	MR. FINNEY: That's all right, but I want
24	to clarify that.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

1	MR. FINNEY: So as to protect our
2	interest.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
4	MR. FINNEY: That's all that's on my mind.
5	I thank you very much.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
7	MR. FINNEY: Good to see you again.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, thanks for
9	coming down.
10	MR. FINNEY: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, good to see you,
12	too.
13	MR. FINNEY: See you Monday night.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Looking forward to
15	it.
16	MR. FINNEY: Good.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now, is
18	there anyone else who would like to testify regarding
19	this case?
20	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, let me just
21	ask Mr. Finney. We weren't clear on the ANC's vote or
22	their position.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, yes. Mr. Finney,
24	the
25	VICE CHAIR HOOD: So I'm sorry you're left
1	1

1	at the table, Mr. Finney, but we weren't clear on the
2	ANC's position. They voted unanimously, according to
3	the letter, for you to come represent them.
4	MR. FINNEY: That's right.
5	VICE CHAIR HOOD: But the ANC didn't take
6	a position then?
7	MR. FINNEY: No, sir. No, sir.
8	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
9	MR. FINNEY: They just deputized me to
10	come down and raise these questions of clarification.
11	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Okay.
12	MR. FINNEY: We weren't opposed.
13	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Right.
14	MR. FINNEY: And so on.
15	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Good.
16	MR. FINNEY: Just for the record for the
17	future.
18	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
19	MR. FINNEY: Thank you.
20	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks again. Sir?
22	MR. DEAN: Good evening, Madam Chairman,
23	members of the Commission. My name is Andrew Dean.
24	I'm a neighbor of Sibley Hospital. I live directly
25	across the street. I have since 1986. I'm very much

1	in favor of the recommended zoning of the R-5-A. I
2	think it's very much in keeping with what the zoning
3	currently is, and it makes logical sense.
4	Sibley has been a wonderful neighbor.
5	They have been very supportive of the community in the
6	good work that they do, and have come before the
7	Commission any time that variances are requested. So
8	I would be most supportive of this zoning.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good.
10	MR. DEAN: That's all I have to say.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Any questions?
12	Okay. Thank you.
13	MR. DEAN: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? Any
15	closing thoughts, Mr. Ellis?
16	MR. ELLIS: Madam Chair, we would just ask
17	for an expedited decision if at all possible.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. I think
19	that we can propose the action tonight and then we'll
20	take final action as soon as we can, provided that we
21	would get the affidavit of maintenance.
22	MR. ELLIS: You'll have the affidavit
23	tomorrow.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Great.
25	MR. ELLIS: Thank you.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Mr. Hood?
2	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, with that I
3	move that we approve proposed map amendment for the
4	zoning of Square N-1448, Lot 803 to the R-5-A Zone as
5	requested upon receiving all the information needed.
6	COMMISSIONER MAY: Second.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any discussion? All
8	those in favor, please, say aye. Aye.
9	ALL: Aye.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed,
11	please, say no.
12	Ms. Sanchez?
13	MS. SANCHEZ: Yes, staff would record the
14	vote 4 to 0 to 1 approving proposed action in Case No.
15	02-29, Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner May
16	seconding, and Commissioners Mitten and Hannaham in
17	favor, Commissioner Parsons not present, not voting.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
19	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I said
20	information. I think I need to be more clear for the
21	record, and I think it's the affidavit of post is what
22	we're looking for.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Affidavit of
24	maintenance.
25	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Maintenance. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. If we're all clear on that, on the Sibley case, then we're concluded with that hearing, and I look forward to seeing you next Monday, Mr. Finney.

MR. FINNEY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

(Whereupon, at 6:57 p.m. a recess until

6:58 p.m.)

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And we're ready to move to our second case, and I'll try not to be too redundant in the introduction. The second case of this evening is Zoning Commission Case No. This is a request by the Office of Planning for a text amendment to Title 11, which is the Zoning Regulations, to create a new W-0 Zoning District.

Notice of this hearing was published in the <u>D.C. Register</u> on November 29, 2002 and in the <u>Washington Times</u> on January 24, 2003. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR section 3021. Those are the procedures for rule making hearings, and one of the notable differences is we don't swear you in, although we do hope that you'll tell the truth.

If you would like a copy of the hearing

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

announcement, again, it's on the table near the door. The order of procedure is largely the same. We'll begin with preliminary matters. Then we'll have the presentation by the Office of Planning, reports of any other Government agencies, reports of anyone who is representing an ANC here this evening, provided that they have appropriate authorization from the ANC, organizations and persons in support, and then organizations and persons in opposition.

Again, organizations will have five minutes. Individuals will have three minutes. And we're going to stick to that as close as we can, because we have a number of people here tonight who would like to testify. I would also note that there is probably, I hope, a witness list at the door, so, please, sign that. It just helps us move in a more orderly fashion through the hearing.

I would just remind anyone who is planning to testify to fill out the two witness cards and give them to the reporter on your way up to testify. I think that's all I need to say again in introduction.

Mr. Bastida, are there any preliminary matters related to this case?

MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, the staff has no preliminary matters. Thank you.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just want to, just for clarification sake, point out that we very purposefully put this text amendment first to talk about creating the W-O Zone District, and then in a later hearing, which will be held on May 19<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 in this room, we will talk about the boathouse. So the boathouse is not a subject for conversation this evening, and if anyone starts to give testimony about the boathouse, I will interrupt you and ask you to just direct your comments exclusively to the W-O Zone District.

We would like to evaluate this Zone District on its own merits and not in relationship to some potential place that it will be mapped. So I just want to caution everybody if they need to amend any of your testimony while you hear the presentation of the Office of Planning, please, do so.

So with that, I think, we're ready to move to the presentation. If you're ready yet. Are you ready? Sir, if you have a question, you can check with staff, and then they will pass it along to us. Okay. We've had a question about after you've watched us go rapidly through the first case, it's unlikely that we'll have a bench decision in this case tonight. It's more likely that we will leave the record open

for additional comments and receipt of other materials.

So, you know, to the extent that you have neighbors who haven't made it down tonight or that they want to submit testimony or any responses you want to give to the things you hear tonight that you may not be fully prepared to give, we will leave the record open for a period of time. I just wanted to let you know that.

I would also like the record to reflect that we've now been joined by Commissioner Parsons. How are we doing down there, Mr. Lawson?

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just turn on the mike there, and we'll be all set. Okay. Whenever you are ready then.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Commission and members of the public. Zoning Commission Case No. 02-42 is for Zoning Regulation Text Amendments to create a new low density W-O Waterfront Open Space Recreation Zone District. The proposed amendment without a new category Zoning Regulation text without mapping the zone, at this time. Rather, the zone would be available for future use as part of planning or development proposals for

waterfront land in the future.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Portions of Washington's waterfront truly constitute a major under utilized asset. While many cities in North America and around the world have reclaimed access to the waterfront simultaneously providing amenity to residents and a cleaner, more ecologically productive river system, the waterfront in portions of the District has received little positive attention.

The waterfront was an important component of both L'Enfant and McNolan Plans for transportation, defense and commercial purposes. Retention of the natural waterfront environment and access for recreation purposes have also been important planning considerations leading to the creation of vast park areas along both the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers.

Generally, this park land is owned by the Federal Government and administered by the National Park Service. Ιt is unzoned, the Federal as Government is not required to adhere to District Zoning Regulations. However, if parcels of these land are sold, leased or traded so that they contain private enterprises, District Zoning would apply. Other portions of the riverfront in many of the more developed portions of the city were, over time, realm to undesirable uses from which the public was often excluded, and the quality of the water was allowed to deteriorate.

immediate Convenient and access from populated areas to the water's edge became difficult and often uninviting. However, the importance of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers to the overall urban fabric of the District is being rediscovered and reemphasized. The comprehensive plan envisions a variety of passive and active waterfront uses. envisions retention or restoration of the natural environment in and in other many areas, areas development which ensures the preservation enhancement of public open space recreation for use by all District residents, in which compliments enhances adjacent urban development and the quality of the rivers.

Public workshops to develop a vision and a plan for the waterfront or for specific areas along the waterfront have reinforced the desire to see greater access, particularly for recreation purposes. In March of 2002, 20 federal and District agencies that own land or have jurisdiction along the Anacostia signed the landmark Anacostia Waterfront Initiative Memorandum of Understanding representing a commitment

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to create an active, cohesive and well-planned Anacostia River Waterfront.

The vision of the AWI is of a clean and vibrant waterfront with parks, recreation uses and places for people to meet, relax, encounter nature and experience the heritage of the waterfront. The AWI also seeks to revitalize surrounding neighborhoods, enhance and protect park areas, improve water quality and the environment, and where appropriate increase access to the water and maritime activities along the waterfront.

In addition, exciting planning initiatives waterfront areas, such as these Southwest Waterfront and Southeast Waterfront Plans, Capitol Gateway and Kingman Island, are underway. land use development proposals for key sections of the waterfront, such as Southeast Federal Center Reservation 13, are in process.

The existing Waterfront Zones W-1, W-2 and W-3 permit many forms of development, including uses that neither require nor enhance the waterfront at densities and heights that would be inappropriate and greater than normally envisioned along portions of the river's edge. They will remain appropriate zones for some areas and some forms of development, but serve a

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

purpose very different from that of the W-O Zone.

response to all of this and past suggestions for the establishment of new Open Space Zoning, the Office of Planning is recommending the creation of a new Waterfront Open Space Recreation The W-0 Zone is intended to help protect Zone. certain waterfront areas from overdevelopment. would provide valuable zoning flexibility by creating low density Waterfront Zone, which would new encourage public park space along the waterfront, as well as low density of water related uses which would enhance the waterfront experience.

zone is not, however, а natural preservation zone. Vast portions of existing park land will remain undeveloped, and the W-O Zone would not be an appropriate zone for these areas. important to remember that this amendment involves a text amendment only. The application does not include amendment lands, map to zone or rezone any businesses or uses to the W-O Zone, at this time. future applications to apply to zone to specific property would require a complete and separate zoning map amendment application with full Zoning Commission and public review.

The goals of the new W-0 Zone, as

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

envisioned by the Office of Planning, are to provide a flexible new planning tool for use in future planning and development proposals; to encourage greater access the water's edge for a variety of active and passive recreation uses; to encourage uses which activate the water surface; expand recreation to opportunities and to encourage a greater sense of stewardship of the rivers; to encourage better protection of the natural environment of the rivers while promoting physical and visual connections to the waterways; activating the public river's edge with waterfront enhancing retail, cultural and recreation uses, but ensure that such uses do not detract from the overall maritime character; and over time, as the zone is applied, to add predictability as the area is intended to be public recreation open space with limited development would be appropriately zoned.

Most open space recreation uses, as envisioned by the Office of Planning, would be permitted as of right, including park open space and playground, this would include pedestrian and bicycle trails, community gardens, temporary markets for produce, arts and crafts, temporary boat construction and nature interpretative center. In response to comments made as part of the public review, OP invites

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

comments on the necessity and means of defining temporary for boat construction and markets.

Uses for which direct access to the river is necessary, and which serve to activate the water surface, are recommended to be permitted by special exception to provide for Zoning Commission or Board of Zoning Adjustment review of the appropriateness of the use to the particular site and a means by which the use is designed and cited to augment, rather than detract from the natural environment and the waterfront experience.

These uses would include marina, which may include a percentage of floating homes, a boathouse for a rowing, kayaking or canoe club and a yacht club. Land based retail, cultural and recreation uses, which would enhance the waterfront experience, would also be permitted by special exception. These uses would include cultural institutions, such as an art gallery, theater, museum or library. is User accessory to boating, such as boat construction, rental and sales, place of worship, private club, recreation building and restaurant and many other forms of retail and services, which relate to or which would enhance the enjoyable experience for waterfront uses.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Guidelines for special exception provide direction for the design of would the facilities and for the review of applications. Commission review special exceptions for proposals that are also requesting initial zoning on any site that is currently unzoned would also be permitted. Regulations pertain to the size and siting of any structures, and parking requirements are also recommended.

FAR lot coverage and height would generally be less than permitted in other Waterfront Zones. FAR and lot coverage for marinas, yacht clubs and boathouses are proposed to be higher than that for other uses to address the unique situation that these uses could be proposed on land that is currently within federally owned park space and unsubdivided. Once the land is subdivided for one of these private uses, it would be removed from public park space requiring a low FAR would result in the subdivision the park of parcels which are larger necessary to accommodate the desired facility size, thus causing the removal of more park land than would otherwise be required.

In addition to Office of Planning notification, OP distributed copies of the W-O Zoning

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

concept form to many waterfront related businesses, community environmental groups, ANCs and individuals, as well as other District agencies. Presentations were made to the Anacostia Waterfront Restoration Committee, the ANC 6D, the ANC 6B and the Washington Waterfront Association. Valuable comments were received as reflected in the more detailed version of the draft W-O Zone attached to the OP report for Zoning Commission information tonight.

While the intent and basic regulations of these zones are unchanged, the report outlines where changes are proposed by the Office of Planning. These include ones to replace the term "houseboat" with "floating home" and provide a revised definition. A higher percentage of floating homes within a marina is also proposed. Add a new clause stating that existing structures or uses with a valid Certificate of Occupancy or business of license as of January 31, 2003 are considered conforming.

This would only come into play if the W-0 Zone were ever proposed for an existing site or use as part of a future rezoning application. Clarify special exception review considerations and application requirements, simplify regulations pertaining to marina, floating home, boathouse and

yacht club uses, remove the previously recommended regulation, which would have limited the amount of site that could be covered with any impervious surface. This was replaced with more general language regarding assessment of the environmental and ecological impacts of development on the waterfront as part of the special exception review process.

Finally, to simplify parking requirements and add bicycle parking space requirements. Again, to compare the proposed W-O Zone to existing Waterfront Zones, the W-O Zone would permit a lower FAR lot coverage and height generally permitted elsewhere and certainly less than permitted other W Zones to provide a new alternative to existing zoning. The text amendment would, therefore, provide a valuable alternative to existing zones.

In conclusion, ΟP feels that the establishment of a new low density Waterfront Zone is desirable. It would be of great benefit along specific portions of the waterfront as the exciting Anacostia Waterfront Initiative and other waterfront related planning initiatives are discussed and implemented. This text amendment would add to the planning tool box for the riverfront areas. It would add long term stability and predictability to the

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

types and intensities of uses along portions of the riverfront.

As noted in the Office of Planning report, OP recommends that the W-O Zoning District initiative be approved. A detailed codified version of the zone is attached to the report for Zoning Commission information. OP now looks forward to receiving additional comments and suggestions from the public and from Commission members regarding what we feel is a very exciting proposal, and we are available to answer questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

Lawson. Any questions for Mr. Lawson? Mr. Hannaham?

MS. McCARTHY: Madam Chair, could I just add one last thing to the Office of Planning report?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure.

MS. McCARTHY: As Mr. Lawson said, we do think that the W-O Zone is a valuable addition to the planning and zoning tool box, and does need to be seen in the context of those various other zones. We know there has been some concern expressed about the special exception uses, and I just wanted to amplify that the special exception uses are basically designed to permit development that fits the standards and the criteria that we articulate in the zone and lay out

very clearly, and it's then an opportunity for the Board of Zoning Adjustment to determine if those uses meet the criteria.

Essentially, the benefits of that are: 1)
That everybody gets to determine whether there is an adverse impact to anything that is proposed on the waterfront, any of those special exception uses, and the benefit is that we get to tailor the consideration of those uses to the individual use and the individual circumstances surrounding that use. So rather then prohibit all, you know, marinas or all museums or places of worship, we articulate a criteria by which that could fit in well with the waterfront uses, and then we permit the Board of Zoning Adjustment to look at that particular use that's proposed, in light of those standards, and make that determination.

Ι think there's been little misunderstanding that the special exception use is a very high hurdle, a difficult barrier and would act to prohibit those uses, and instead what we are trying to do is just make sure that the uses that we spell out by special exception can exist, but can exist in a way that meets the standards for the waterfront and they have adverse impacts on neighboring any property and neighboring users. Thanks.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr.

Hannaham?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Thank you, Madam My first question relates to the boundaries of this text amendment, you know. Are we looking at the total District of Columbia, and are the boundaries of the District of Columbia included in the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers? I know there was mention of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative. I saw one slot earlier that showed something on the western side as I think it was Poplar Point. I'm just trying well. to get a better feel as to what the boundaries are, for envisioned the boundaries particular text amendment.

MR. LAWSON: Yes, counselor, the proposal is for a text amendment only. We are not proposing that the zone be applied to any lands, at this time. In theory, the zone could be applied anywhere within the District.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.

MS. McCARTHY: Okay. Actually, we should slightly modify that. It has been proposed for mapping, but only in one area, and that was the Southeast Federal Center overall zoning proposal that we presented to the Commission, so it's only for those

lands that are currently part of the federally controlled Southeast Federal Center, at this point in time, and just for a strip that's along the waterfront in the Southeast Federal Center. But other than that, the purpose -- and that's an entirely separate case. But what's before us tonight is simply to determine should this be a zone that is available, should the Commission wish to map it in appropriate places in the District of Columbia.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. The only follow-up to that is since you are looking at Poplar Point in this text, have you confided with the people who live in that community? I'm thinking about the W-8, the ANC and the other communities in that part of the zone.

MS. McCARTHY: When and if the Office of Planning proposes this to be applied to Poplar Point or any other place.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.

MS. McCARTHY: We will spend a considerable amount of time working with whatever area the W-O Zone would be proposed for, but, at this point in time, it's just the creation of the zone itself. We haven't looked at applying it to any place other than the very limited application in the Southeast

Federal Center.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. Okay.

Thank you. I'll try hard to keep myself focused then.

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would just like to amend one thing, which is we have advertised it, in the alternative, outside, but that's for the 19<sup>th</sup> of May, so we are just trying to divorce ourselves of any specific location and just trying to decide if the text makes sense to establish. Anyone else have questions?

UNKNOWN PERSON: Does that include the audience?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, sir. No, sir, sorry.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I just wanted to ask about the measuring of height. I think I saw on the slide Mr. Lawson said above the water surface, I really don't want to ask this question, because, I mean, you know, what if you have a wave, but anyway, I really didn't follow that, and realistically I said it in a joke, but that's what I was sitting here thinking. You know, because what will happen is applicant gets to come in and it depends on what day if it's a high tide or whatever

the case is. If you can just explain to me above the water surface?

MR. LAWSON: The intention is that there would be two separate measurements for height within the W-O Zone. One would be the more standard kind of a measurement for land based structures, something like a boathouse. That would allow a height of 40 feet, actually. There is a separate kind of section of structures, which basically relates to floating homes within a marina and how high a floating home within a marina should be.

There was some discussion that the height that would be permitted for a floating home should be somewhat less to preserve views and to preserve sort of the waterfront character. So we proposed a height of 25 feet, that would be measured from the --normally, it's measured from the high water mark along the shoreline, but I don't disagree with you that this is probably something that we, Office of Planning, should discuss with the DCRA, probably, to see if they have suggestions for kind of tightening that section up.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: I would agree. I just see us opening up for a lot of different interpretations, so that would be good if we could do

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Actually, I wanted to 3 follow-up on that, because as you are making your presentation, and I was thinking you used the word 5 land based uses, and I find this interesting to know if it's true, do we have jurisdiction over the water? 6 I mean, as we talk about some of these things, I 8 mean, does our jurisdiction extend to the water? 9 MR. LAWSON: Certainly my understanding 10 from discussions that we do have jurisdiction out to a certain extent within the water. 11 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And when you say to a 13 certain extent? 14 I knew you were going to ask MR. LAWSON: 15 me that. To be honest, I can't remember, and I can 16 again clarify that. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I think we 18 need that, because we shouldn't give people the 19 impression that we have control over something that we 20 don't, and we also shouldn't fool ourselves. 21 shouldn't include something in the ordinance if it's 22 really not within our jurisdiction. So I think that 23 we need to explore that a little bit more. 24 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Madam Chairman,

could I just throw a thought in there? I remember in

1	recent past, the District took great pride in its 26
2	miles of shoreline, which was officially the basis for
3	everything that the District did.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
5	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: In terms of
6	looking at water quality and the whole bit in the
7	Potomac and Anacostia.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I understand that
9	I just didn't know how far does our reach go.
10	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Well, earlier when
11	I asked, they told me that this proposed text would
12	include the District boundaries of the Potomac and
13	Anacostia.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And how far does that
15	go, though?
16	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Oh.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I mean, I don't know,
18	you know, in different jurisdictions it goes to the
19	middle of the body of water.
20	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Oh, no.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Or it's at the bulk
22	end.
23	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: It's shore to
24	shore for us.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: The 2 configured, I would think that it would be shore to 3 shore. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 5 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Within the District boundaries. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else 8 have any questions? Mr. Parsons? 9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I wanted to focus 10 on, let me see, section 905.5, and I'll read it for 11 those members of the audience that may not have it 12 handy, but it talks about Zoning Commission review, 13 and it says "In the case of a request for initial 14 zoning of a property to the W-O District, the Zoning 15 Commission may review special exception variance 16 request simultaneously with the Zoning Map Amendment Application." 17 I agree with this. It is a new role for 18 19 the Zoning Commission, and is this an initial zoning 20 of private land as well? I mean, now if we wanted to 21 apply this to the Anacostia Waterfront, the Buzzard Point area for instance, how would that come before us 22 23 in this section? 24 MR. LAWSON: It's certainly mУ 25 understanding that all private land is already zoned,

so initial zoning would not apply to private land. It would apply more to federal property, which is currently unzoned, but for some purpose zoning is being proposed for the lands.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just wanted to follow-up on that just to be clear, because it doesn't say the initial zoning of a property that happens to be the W-O District. It says the initial zoning of a property to the W-O District. So any time a property would be zoned or rezoned, that would be an initial zoning to the W-O. So is it your intention that it would only be when the property is going from unzoned to W-O that that would apply?

I mean, I can see how it could apply. I mean, if the idea is to make it an efficient process for someone, then I think it would apply even if it was being rezoned.

MR. LAWSON: I would agree with that. The intent of this was, of course, to streamline the process. People were coming before the Zoning Commission for a rezoning application to deal with other issues that surround the application, rather than having to go through a two step process.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. LAWSON: So I certainly would be.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So we probably just need to get rid of the word initial, and then I think that will convey it better. Thank you. Anyone else have questions for the Office of Planning? Anyone on the Commission have questions for the Office of Planning? Okay.

I don't have any reports from any other Government agencies. Is there anyone else here representing a Government agency? Ma'am? It's not on. It went off. Okay.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: Good evening, Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. I am Sally Blumenthal representing the National Park Service, and I would like to share with you the views of the National Park Service on the proposed regulations to create the new W-O Waterfront Open Space Zoning District.

The Park Service supports the Commission and the Office of Planning in the creation of this zone to provide for waterfront park open space. We believe that it is essential for the implementation of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative, which we have been actively engaged in and strongly support as well.

We also hope that this will lead to other Open Space Zones that the Commission may consider in the future.

The Park Service manages about 20 miles of shoreline riverfront parks on the Potomac Anacostia Rivers in the District of Columbia. Generally, we provide for the recreational needs of our visitors through concessions, either owned operated facilities, marinas, golf courses, those sorts of facilities. An example of that is the Thompson's Boat Center in Georgetown, which is our boat center that is where we store rowing shells, kayaks, canoes, that sort of non motorized waterfront craft.

In the last 15 years or so, the sport of rowing has increased dramatically. Right now, the college rowing programs operating of are Thompson's and are initiating the process to move to their own facilities to operate their collegiate rowing programs in the that the other manner collegiate rowing programs in the country work. about two, maybe three cases where have these university or high school scholastic programs need fee title to the land to erect their boathouses for a variety of reasons.

In those circumstances, the Park Service

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

would use our authorities to exchange property with these universities, the eight sites for boathouses. They would acquire private property for us, and we would exchange fee title for fee title, so that there's no net loss of park land. We also, by doing this, tend to keep these boathouse sites to an absolute minimum lot size, so that there is no real net loss of park land, and we also would impose perpetual covenants governing design and operational requirements of these boathouses.

By approaching the establishment of university boathouses in this manner, we believe we can minimize the amount of riverfront open space that's removed from public ownership and yet retain a park like setting surrounding the boathouses, in effect, they will become in-holdings within park land similar to Potomac Boat Club in Georgetown or the Washington Canoe Club.

In each instance involving a land exchange for construction of a university boathouse, the Zoning Commission will be provided with a design concept that has been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, the Old Georgetown Board, the Historic Preservation Review Board, the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service. And in that connection, we

have a number of concerns with some of the parts of this proposed Open Space Zone.

We recognize that the Office of Planning did analyze the creation of boathouse sites in a number of instances relating to lot occupancy, FAR, parking, side yard requirements, but we don't think that these proposals will be able to meet what's identified or proposed in this Waterfront Zone. For instance, we will not be allowing parking on these boathouse sites, because we will be providing parking elsewhere. We don't believe parking should be on the waterfront. It's an appropriate use for the open space of these shoreline parks. Although, you are proposing a parking requirement.

Boathouses unlike marinas are boathouses for non motorized watercraft, unlike marinas is a fairly large structure in a fairly small space, because the boats are all stored inside the boathouse. A marina, on the other hand, is a structure with a fairly large dock space that's where the boats are stored. This is what causes the problems that we see with the lot occupancy and the FAR.

The other concern that we have is with this 20 foot setback requirement. We think that could be problematic due to the depth of the boathouse sites

being created. In general, we appreciate that this 20 foot setback is to create public promenade or other riverfront public way, but we believe in the case of a boathouse that public safety is also an issue, and in these circumstances would prefer the pathways to be to the rear of these facilities. We would be very pleased to work with the Office of Planning to achieve the mutual objective, and I would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any questions? Mr. Hood? VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I just want to ask Ms. Blumenthal has the National Park Service already been working with the Office of Planning? MS. BLUMENTHAL: Through the Anacostia Initiative, not specifically on this proposal. VICE CHAIR HOOD: Not specifically, okay. Thank you. MS. BLUMENTHAL: Yes. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: In a more generic sense, you mentioned specifically, as it relates to these prospective boathouse sites, that you may be exchanging other land for, that you will not allow

parking on those sites, but as a more generic policy

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

for other uses that might emerge where we might map this zone and then the uses that would go there, from the Park Service's prospective, would you recommend eliminating the parking requirement?

As you described, you would have parking provided elsewhere. It's not that there won't be parking provided, it will be provided away from the waterfront. Would you recommend that as a wholesale approach?

MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, I think maybe the approach should be some flexibility dependent upon the particular circumstances, because there could very well be other areas when this is implemented where imposing a specific parking requirement right on the waterfront might be exactly the wrong thing to do.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: I think.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else have questions? Mr. Hannaham?

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: I was just curious about Park Service's general philosophy with respect to the District in the exchange of or swapping of properties. Much of the District recreational areas would fall on Park Service and they were transferred one way or another. I see the potential for a lot

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

more happening, you know, in these areas if there was a proactive attitude on the part of the Park Service to make these things happen.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, let me address two parts of your question. You are, I believe, referring to the very large transaction that the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and the National Capital Planning Commission undertook in the '70s to transfer the jurisdiction of the various local recreation properties, the playgrounds, the rec centers and the community parks from the National Park Service to the District of Columbia.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Right.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: In that case, the properties still remain public. It was just administered by the District of Columbia as opposed to the Park Service and it's not at all what we're talking about here.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Yes.

MS. BLUMENTHAL: In two, perhaps three circumstances that we're aware of, we would actually be exchanging fee title with a non governmental entity, a private entity in exchange for fee title to an equivalently valued property to include within the park system. So while we would be giving up park

1	land, in return we would be acquiring equivalent park
2	land.
3	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: All right. No, I
4	appreciate that. I was thinking more in terms of the
5	GSA, this new initiative where GSA enabled the
6	District to take over property for a variety of
7	purposes, other than governmental.
8	MS. BLUMENTHAL: The Southeast Federal
9	Center?
10	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Right. The
11	Southeast Federal Center. I mean, is National Park
12	Service thinking along those kinds of lines, too? I
13	mean, it's just another Government agency.
14	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Well, we haven't give it
15	any thought at all.
16	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: That's a lot of
17	tourists.
18	MS. BLUMENTHAL: Our mission and GSA's
19	mission are very different.
20	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: I realize that,
21	yes.
22	MS. BLUMENTHAL: And they got special
23	legislation to facilitate redevelopment and
24	revitalization of that property.
25	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Right. I

1	understand that. But I just wondered whether you will
2	be supportive of that kind of legislative initiative
3	if it should occur?
4	MS. BLUMENTHAL: I'm not sure I'm
5	prepared. I don't know. I suppose we would have to
6	look at it on a case by case basis and what the
7	objective was, yes.
8	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. Thank you
9	very much then.
10	MS. BLUMENTHAL: You're welcome.
11	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Thank you, Madam
12	Chair.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else, any
14	questions? All right. Thank you. And if you had
15	something, written testimony that you could provide?
16	No? I'll just have to take good notes. Okay.
17	Besides we have our little resource here that we can
18	get. Okay. Anyone else, Government agency? All
19	right.
20	Then we have a few people, let's see,
21	maybe just one, representing ANC 6D. Mr. Johnson?
22	MR. JOHNSON: Johnson.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. You're learning
24	a lot about zoning, right?
25	MR. JOHNSON: I've been having a very

accelerated education process in the last few months.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just identify yourself for the record as you begin speaking.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. For the record, my name is Ed Johnson. I'm the secretary of ANC 6D and the Commissioner for ANC 6D-01.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Go ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: Great. In the interest of saving some time, I would ask that our full written testimony, which you should have received a copy of earlier today, and I apologize for the lateness of them coming in, be submitted into the record so that we can more expeditiously use this time to discuss more important issues from the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine.

MR. JOHNSON: In that case, just leaping in, the major items of concerns for the community are as follows: 1) There is significant concern among stakeholders along the Southwest Waterfront where the W-O Zoning could be applied in a way that would be detrimental to stakeholders and to the public. While the Office of Planning final report dated February 28<sup>th</sup> states that they do not propose that any lands be zoned W-O as part of the Zoning Commission case, and offer assurances that they do not intend to do so to

businesses along the Southwest Waterfront in a December 2002 memorandum, and that's attached to the package you should have received.

The Office of Planning wrote that the W-O Zone was indeed intended to apply to areas in the Southwest Waterfront. The comprehensive plan calls for significant development as does the Office of Planning's new Southwest Waterfront Plan. To the extent that these regulations may conflict with plans for the Southwest Waterfront, they are inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and would violate D.C. Office Code section 664102. Actually, in the issue of brevity, I may abbreviate the rest of these Code references if it's okay with the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great.

MR. JOHNSON: And I promise not to read them. They are also attached. The application of this zone to existing businesses or organizations in this area would certainly be to greatly diminished property values. D.C. Official Code, as cited above, states that the regulations should encourage stability of land values within a District. An improperly applied W-O Zone in Southwest could have a devastating effect on land and marina values, and the final set down document does not provide adequate measures to

ensure against that.

2) One attempt to address the issue of protecting stakeholders in section 901.6 is hazy at best, and also inconsistent with the above mentioned D.C. official code, as well as other existing DCRA regulations. 6641 states that a lawful use of a building or premises preexisting the adoption of a regulation is lawful. The language does not allow for retroactive application of a Zoning Regulation.

Additionally, grandfathering in an existing business based on master business license issuance is not consisting with loading generally where it's a Certificate of Occupancy that matters. Moving along to Certificate of Occupancies, DCRA has not ruled whether docks on the water are required to have C of O's, and has stated that none of the marinas and yacht clubs in the District have Certificates of Occupancy for their docks. Excuse me, I've been talking so much recently, I'm running out of voice.

That's not to say the marinas often have offices and lands that have Certificates of Occupancy, but the docks themselves do not. If DCRA were to rule that such permits are required and a W-O Zone were applied to existing properties, then all the marinas and yacht clubs in the city would have to shut down,

because they wouldn't meet the W-0 Zoning Requirements.

disagree with Mr. Parsons here I'm afraid, I hope I'm convincing, absolute discretion by the Office of Planning under section 905 for special exceptions, essentially, violates the great weight given to recommendations of ANC under D.C. Official Code. The Zoning Commission amends regulations under 641 without initial triage by the Office of Planning, but subject to great weight afforded to ANC recommendations. The effect of getting preliminary screenings of the Office of Planning is what the Office of Planning has now put on equal footing with the ANC, thereby diminishing the role of the citizens in the neighborhoods that would be most affected by such application of this W-O Zoning.

The statute does not support the Office of Planning attempting to increase its authority, and there's no valid public policy reason why any of the proposed special exception uses should always be subject to Office of Planning review, even in a W-1 Zone.

4) The mayor recently stated that his goal is to increase the population of District residents to

800,000. DHCD has partnered with the Office of Planning to ensure that boats on the waterfront continue to be another affordable housing resource, and the section of the snap is also attached in the package. We have you cluster 9. Nevertheless, this proposal limits the number of live-aboards through zoning and does not allow for residential use of any kind, even as a special exception in a W-O Zone.

These positions of the Office of Planning are inconsistent with the mayor's initiative and the I'm going to add briefly to my written snap. testimony. As someone pointed out to me earlier, there is no law or regulation in the District of Columbia that limits the number of live-aboard boaters in a marina. This would be the first and only limitation of that type. There is, however, Bill 1518, I have to refer to it, before the City Council now that would actually not allow limits to be placed live-aboards, so the Office of Planning on proposing something that is in direct contradiction to a Bill that's before the City Council now.

5) The Zoning Commission advertised on January 24, 2003, also attached, that the regulations will apply to Anacostia Park or abutting property east of the river owned by WMATA and Pepco. The

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

regulations, as they will apply to Anacostia Park, are inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of the National Capital Planning Commission, which calls for a working boatyard where the former Tommy Long's Anacostia Marina was located. I can assure you that's a concern to many people here tonight.

reason to restrict yacht clubs from renting slips to transients as proposed in section 917. This restriction will make the District a non-friendly destination for tourists. Also, the District owns marinas that allow transients, so there is some question of a conflict of interest in doing this.

Again, the Office of Planning is inconsistent in recommending cruise line use and facilities as a special exception on one area while limiting tourist activity in another. Finally, and I'm speaking on behalf of the ANC tonight and not as an individual Commissioner. We certainly recognize the many benefits that a properly applied W-O Zoning could bring to neighborhoods throughout our city, and I have to commend Mr. Lawson for having done an outstanding job with communicating with my people or we would have a much longer list than we do tonight.

However, this proposal fails to provide

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

clear and substantive protections to prevent the possible abuse of the zoning to the detriment of long term stakeholders. In addition, the potential for application of a W-O Zoning when a business changes hands and applies for a new Certificate of Occupancy could deter new investment and be a stumbling block, rather than a stepping stone to achieve the goals of the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative and other plans.

Finally, this proposal, Mr. Parsons, I'm doing my best to convince you, that's too much discretion in the Office of Planning and calls for regulation of business and housing at a level that we feel is more appropriate to DCRA, DPW, DHCD, other regulatory agencies. The Office of Planning should be in the planning business, not the regulating business.

Again, you know, such allowable discretion by Office of Planning effectively circumvents a public process of community input and could lead to the disenfranchisement of people that would be most effected at the local grass roots level. Until those concerns are addressed, we stand opposed to the Open Space Zone. But I would like to assure that we do approve of it in concept, and we would support this proposal if the previous amendments and community concerns are addressed. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Are there any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That was my line. Let me just perhaps put your mind at ease about one or The first is that the section 905, the two things. Office of Planning review, that formalizes in this context what always happens. When get an we application for any kind of text amendment, amendment, plan unit development, we consider whether or not to set it down after we've gotten a report from the Office of Planning just to decide if we're even going to have a hearing, and then it goes back to them, because they are our technical support, if you will.

So it's not giving them authority to do decision making, it's just setting a framework for the analysis that they will do to inform the Commission. It all takes place here. So we hear from them and we hear from the community, so it doesn't give them any kind of trump card over you.

The other thing about the advertisement on the  $24^{\rm th}$  of January, your point 5, that was a mistake. That was just an error. So you can just completely disregard anything that was in that particular hearing

2

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

announcement.

MR. JOHNSON: That's wonderful to hear.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I appreciate you pointing out some of these things, because this is an area that we don't usually talk about, marinas and so forth, making the distinction between the business licenses and Certificates of Occupancy, and actually, I don't know if you have a copy of the specific text with the red in it, but the Office of Planning in making their recommendations to us have recognized that distinction, and we're happy for you to call it out for our information as well. But we definitely won't overlook that.

So let me see if anyone has any questions for Mr. Johnson. Mr. Hood?

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Yes, Mr. Johnson, first of all, let me just say that I can appreciate you having issues and then also having solutions. I can appreciate that. Most of the time we hit issues, but we don't have any solutions. 3, I'm just trying to understand what you're saying here, and I think the Chair answered one of my questions. But you have here the effect of giving preliminary screening to the Office of Planning is that the Office of Planning is now being put on the equal footing with the ANC. I'm

just trying to understand what you mean.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. JOHNSON: Well, and again, that may have been. I think Chairman Mitten addressed much of that concern. The way that read to me was that there's a whole entire prequalification process that's not done in the public eye, and that recommendations be made to you before those recommendations were made to the community.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: I mean, no disrespect to Mr. Lawson, who I'm very fond of, but pulling paper out of OP is not easy, even for an ANC Commissioner, and there is concern that if we allow them even the appearance of the ability not to share with the public, that they will not share with the public.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: And you are right. The Chairman did answer my second question I was going to ask you, but I just was going to also let you know that while we give ANC great weight, by law we're required to give the Office of Planning that same great weight.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: It's understood.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: I just wanted to make

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

sure that was clear. MR. JOHNSON: All right. I have no doubt. VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Okay. I will ask later on, Madam Chair, while I haven't had a chance to 5 look through all of what Mr. Johnson has provided, that we, if we send it back to OP or whatever, also 6 some of the issues that he had in his 8 testimony or his correspondence and then see where OP 9 stands with some of the recommendations we see here. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure. 11 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 13 VICE CHAIR HOOD: Thanks. 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else have 15 questions? Mr. Parsons? 16 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, Mr. Johnson, 17 are we okay? Because I share your views about a potential private, if you will, closed door session. 18 19 That's not what's envisioned here at all. Are you okay with that now? So we have no agreement? 20 21 MR. JOHNSON: Absolutely not. I've just become kind of attuned to various sections of this 22 23 we've been working feverishly. thing, as As 24 responded to Mr. Hood, the reason I'm able to offer

substantive, I hope what are substantive, helpful

solutions is because I have had the support of a tremendous number of people who've spent countless hours supporting me. I'm really blessed with a fabulous constituency. But we're okay. I think we're on the same page here.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I did want to pursue one thing you said, and it has to do with what is commonly known as Tommy Long's Marina. I think you've heard the Park Service here tonight testify that there is no intention to take a marina operation like that, which is a concession operation, or any of the others, James Creek Marina, I believe is in your ANC.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And apply this kind of zoning. It will not apply to federal property, so I want to make sure you understood that.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, yes. I think everyone understands what the intentions are. A great deal of concern is that if that property were turned over, then this could be applied, and it could be problematic. I don't think there's a question of understanding.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: A concern that it could be

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

abused under certain circumstances, and that 2 protections should be built in not made as statements 3 in the report. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I see. Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, Mr. Hannaham, did you have questions? 6 7 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: I thank you very 8 much, too, for your statement. Could you help me? 9 I'm just trying to get a better sense of what 10 constitutes a marina? Would a fish market set up down 11 in Southwest where you have these boats holed up and 12 are used for retail and fish products, would those be 13 marinas? 14 MR. JOHNSON: You know, the fish wharf, 15 and actually one of my constituents is here from the fish wharf, who could probably answer that question 16 17 better than I. I might defer that. I'm not sure I 18 could answer you correctly, but I expect he could. 19 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Because marina is 20 frequently mentioned. I'm trying to get a better 21 sense of what the retail establishments are, and maybe that's where that business would be classified, but 22 23 I'm not really clear, and I thought you might be able to help me.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I mean, marinas tend

24

to, you know, have multi function uses.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: It can be a combination of public and private where you have a marina that has docks that are accessible to the public, as well as part of it being for berthing boats, which is a typical use of a marina.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: We have a significant live-aboard population here in the District of Columbia who live aboard their boats. They are D.C. residents. They are tax payers.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Yes

MR. JOHNSON: I'm one of them for 10 years. I have a great deal of expertise in liveaboard boating. They can also be commercial establishments, whether it is cruise ships, whether it is retail services. There's probably a technical definition of marina versus wharfage that I'm not sure I'm competent to answer though.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Yes. Another category of boating that struck my mind when I was reading this stuff was sports fishing or people who charter boats and go out for whatever reason, whether it's for fishing or just for the pleasure of boating.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Is there any business like that?
2	MR. JOHNSON: Oh, absolutely.
3	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.
4	MR. JOHNSON: You know, I reside at the
5	Gangplank. There are a number of boats that are
6	available for charter. There's not a whole lot of
7	sport fishing on the Potomac.
8	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: But the pleasure
9	boating?
10	MR. JOHNSON: There's more catfishing on
11	the Potomac.
12	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. But
13	pleasure boating?
14	MR. JOHNSON: There's a great deal of
15	pleasure boating, and as soon as it quits snowing, I'm
16	heading down river to escape testimony myself.
17	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. That's
18	fine. I really do appreciate your statement, and
19	we're going to give it a real good hard look.
20	MR. JOHNSON: Thank you very much.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? I did
22	want to just address something to you, because it was
23	your comments, but also because of the folks that you
24	have with you, you know, seeking guarantees about
	1

zoning. Well, I mean, there aren't. You know, zoning

is not ecstatic. You know, it changes over time. But I will say that there is a bias against creating nonconforming uses, and so knowing that there is this bias against, you know, taking an area that's already built to some extent and then, in effect, down zoning stuff that already exists is totally counter productive for everybody. It's not going to get you anything. So all it does is hurt people. So that's not what we're in the business of doing.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, understood, I think, outside of the scope of what I would be competent to talk about. I mean, I think there is concern and I'm sure that individuals or Commissioners will share that it could be, in fact, done that way so that their loss is someone else's gain. I think that is a concern that many of my constituents have. I didn't address it specifically and I won't here, because I'm not going to speak to something where I don't know the facts. But I do know that that is a concern.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: And I know Mr. Lawson has worked hard on this, and I hate to beat him over the head, but 901.6 isn't good. I would ask the Commission to really brief its 901.6.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That actually is --

1	MR. JOHNSON: That's the grandfathering,
2	but like I said it uses master business license and
3	the whole issue of Certificate of Occupancy.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
5	MR. JOHNSON: I would look at making that
6	a stronger, better
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	MR. JOHNSON: Not eliminate it, please,
9	no.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. I was like
11	what's wrong with 901.6?
12	MR. JOHNSON: No, no, no.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You want it to be
14	improved?
15	MR. JOHNSON: Yes.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
17	MR. JOHNSON: I would like to see it made
18	stronger, move effective. Again, when you deal with
19	water and repairing rights there's a great deal of
20	complexity to things.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Certainly.
22	MR. JOHNSON: So I know I'm not the final
23	expert on that, but I know there's one behind me.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We'll get to
25	them.

MR. JOHNSON: Super. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I think 3 that's it. MR. JOHNSON: Great. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much. 6 MR. JOHNSON: Ms. Mitten, thank you very much. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Now, 9 anyone else for ANC that is not on my list? 10 Then we will move to organizations and persons in support, and we'll start with the three folks from 11 12 Georgetown, Mr. Brangman and Mr. Gross and Mr. Kirwin. 13 And I would just say that you'll have to decide who 14 is going to get the five minutes and then the other two will get three. And I know you're not going to 15 talk about the boathouse. 16 If you're going to show a picture of the 17 18 boathouse, just keep it. We're not going to look at 19 pictures of the boathouse. We're not talking about That's May 19<sup>th</sup>. Okay. 20 the boathouse. Not tonight. 21 MR. GROSS: Good evening, Madam Chairman, members of the Commission. I am Nathan W. Gross of 22 23 Arnold and Porter. With me are Alan Brangman, a university architect of Georgetown University, and 24

William Kirwin of Muse Architects, the designer of the

proposed Georgetown boathouse. By way of clarification, Madam Chair, the 3 only idea of Mr. Kirwin's testimony would be to relate to specific standards in the zone as illustrated by 5 the boathouse. We can probably do that without I understand your concern. 6 pictures. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But I just don't want 8 to -- I would appreciate it if you kept it as generic 9 as possible. 10 MR. GROSS: Very good, we will. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 12 MR. GROSS: And we will begin with Mr. Brangman followed by Mr. Kirwin, and then I will make 13 14 some regulatory comments at the end. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So are we giving Mr. Brangman the five minutes? 16 MR. GROSS: We will be within those time 17 18 limits pretty easily. If you are saying we have a 19 total of five plus three minutes, we may be within 20 five minutes. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We'll put you 22 on five and do your best as a group. Mr. Brangman? 23 MR. BRANGMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. name is Alan Brangman. I am a university architect 24 25 for Georgetown University. I am here this evening

speaking in favor of the W-O Overlay with conditions. What I wanted to do though was speak very quickly about a process that the university has been involved in, which initially when the W-O was laid down had caused us some concerns, and that is we felt that the process that we had gone through in the agreement that we had struck with the National Park Service actually provided for a number of the issues that were being raised by the W-O category.

That being the discussions with respect to that agreement were very similar to a PUD. We dealt with issues of lot coverage, with issues of building height, with issues of setback, with issues parking, with issues of easement, all the types of concerns that the Zoning Commission certainly would have as they were looking at a piece of property that previously been unzoned, which had is why specifically were coming forward with category one, our W-1 category.

Our concern or one of the concerns that we have with respect to the W-O is that given the fact that our application was put in in July and one of the issues that the Commission has raised with respect to our application and the W-O was that we hopefully could be reviewed as tandem applications, and the

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

biggest concern we had was with respect to timing. 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. 3 Because clearly, with the MR. BRANGMAN: set down date that we have now, and thank you very 5 much for that date in May, we are two months short of a year, and if the review of W-O is going to be much 6 longer than what it has been currently, then we have 8 got significant issues that we have to be concerned 9 about with respect to being able to get through the 10 process with ease. 11 I do say in support of the zone, however, 12 that there have been a number of changes and 13 amendments to it. I think that a number of the issues 14 that we were dealing with as a PUD with respect to our 15 agreement have now been taken care of with the 16 exception of one that Mr. Kirwin will speak about, but 17 as long as this can be done in a timely fashion, then 18 the university certainly will be happy with 19 Thank you. process. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And we're mindful of 21 your needs. 22 MR. BRANGMAN: Yes, thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Kirwin? 24 MR. KIRWIN: Yes, thank you. The one 25 issue that we have with the W-O Zoning, and it will

become an issue with many boathouses on the Georgetown waterfront and possibly other waterfronts, as well, is the waterfront setback.

It is in conflict with the need for boathouses to be as close to the river and the water as much as possible, and in conflict with the narrowness of the sites that we have along the waterfront.

Boathouses such as Georgetown's have to store rowing shells, and these shells are 69 feet long. When you get into the details of laying out the building plan, you are going to run into difficulties fitting these buildings on these waterfront sites with the setback that is required in the regulations.

Furthermore, the stated goals of early drafts of the waterfront setback regulation would encourage public access along the waterfront. Private uses such as Georgetown University will need to limit public access along the waterfront, because for water safety reasons, as well as for security reasons. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you. Mr. Gross?

MR. GROSS: Yes. First, I would like to commend the Office of Planning and the Zoning

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Commission for this initiative. I think it's a very superior professional and technical job on the regulation and fills a very important need in the city.

I also especially think that the combined map application and special exception process is innovative and very good since a fair number of these sites will be previously unzoned property, as I understand it.

A couple of regulatory comments, one is on flexibility. Mr. Kirwin didn't give the full -- I will just mention that our proposed boathouse at Georgetown is very tight on lot occupancy, very tight on FAR, but complies and then does not comply with the setback, so we would have one variance request.

I guess the comment I would like to make is that a variance test requires a uniqueness of the property and a finding of a peculiar or exceptional problem using it under zoning. And if you think of, in particular, the Anacostia Park on the east bank of the Anacostia, much of it is simply grassland going down to the river, and someone goes in and says we comply with A, B and C. We need a variance on this, and then the Commission or the Board says what is your unique condition of your property, and it's difficult

to make that case, and some of this just relates to site size, too.

The Park Service or the D.C. Recreation, if that's the case, may not want to give up more park land than they need to, and so if the site is somewhat tight, then you are throwing over lot occupancy right away.

My thought is that this process is somewhat like a simplified planned unit development, and there in the PUD regulations themselves, there is a string of three provisions that provide that yards, courts and lot occupancy shall be as provided in the regulations, but the Commission may modify those based on the particular case.

Then there is another one that allows up to a 5 percent increase in FAR height. In other words, that is capped, and those are the two sensitive ones. I think something along those lines might be worth considering looking towards the objective of keeping most of these cases as special exceptions. The plans will be on the table. A degree of flexibility like that could avoid awkward variance applications.

The second comment is just to add to what Mr. Kirwin said about the setback. The Potomac River

Yacht Association also in their written submission commented on this extensively. I mean, essentially, I think the key is is just to not impede access to the waterfront by the public, and I think most of these will be fairly isolated along the river.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

MR. GROSS: And probably won't. I have just a couple of other quick comments if you would, Madam Chair, just 30 seconds.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. GROSS: Just on the general concern, I guess, of many of the people here about inappropriate mapping this, and let's say on the southwest waterfront where there is existing businesses. There is the rule in the home overlay that zoning shall not be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan and, at present, the Southwest Waterfront is zoned. Low density is indicated as low density commercial on the Southwest Waterfront. So it would be pretty hard to introduce the W-O Zone.

Now, when the south estimate plan is adopted, and there may be certain limited open space areas in that plan, those limited areas might well be suitable, but anyway, that's just a thought on that issue.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good point.

MR. GROSS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I hope everyone in the audience heard you. Any questions for these gentlemen, any questions? All right. Thank you. I look forward to seeing you on the 19<sup>th</sup> and bring your pictures back. Okay.

And then we also have Mr. Morris from the Sierra Club. And is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? Come forward if you would like to testify in support. Oh, Mr. Woodworth, yes, I see you. I am sorry, I didn't have a check next to your name. Both of these gentleman are going to have five minutes.

Mr. Morris, whenever you are ready just introduce yourself and begin.

MR. MORRIS: Yes, ma'am. I am Bob Morris and I am the conservation chair of the D.C. Chapter of the Sierra Club, and I am here to support the proposed W-O Zone. It is seen as a positive and useful classification to apply to areas on the waterfront that are being proposed for redevelopment. These areas should be cultivated to promote access to the waterfront by residents and visitors.

The concerns, however, about the W-0

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

classification fall into two categories, and these are just things to amend the proposed text. Those categories are protection of the rivers and conservation of the valuable undeveloped riverfront areas.

First, under protection of the rivers, our rivers are currently under performing as economic, aesthetic and recreational assets, because they are polluted. It is essential that all future uses contribute to the extensive and expensive efforts now underway to reduce those pollution levels.

The W-O Zone classification should specifically require than any development use best practices to prevent runoff and pollution. These should include, but not be limited to, the use of low impact development technology, such as bio-retention cells, porous pavers, rain gardens, green roofs, etcetera, as appropriate for whatever the proposed usage is.

Additionally, the use of trees in a riparian barrier should be encouraged to take advantage of their unique hydrologic functions and aesthetic and urban heat control features. Second, oh, and along those lines, parking, it was brought up earlier about parking on the waterfront. Parking on

the waterfront is always bad for the river itself because of runoff concerns.

Also, in terms of setbacks of structures, the setbacks are designed again to protect the river itself, which is the primary asset that we are concerned with here. The conservation of undeveloped riverfront areas, the District is uniquely blessed with wild undeveloped park land on our riverfronts.

These areas are generally west of Key Bridge and along the west banks of the Anacostia, and some on the east banks of the Anacostia. From both river and shore, they provide a natural experience that is seldom possible within the confines of a major city. They also provide unmatchable hydrologic services in protecting the river and cleaning and cooling the air.

The W-O Zone should not be applied to currently undeveloped areas. These named areas, West Key Bridge to the District line and on the banks and islands of the Anacostia should be designated as no new development zones to ensure future generations have the possibility of a wild, natural experience within our urban environment.

While it's my understanding that the above goals are generally within the intent of the Office of

2	amend the proposed working of the Zoning Regulations
3	to ensure that this is clear to current and future
4	residents, prospective developers and zoning
5	officials.
6	The Commission is the agency that most
7	clearly can set these parameters to maintain and even
8	improve the quality of our rivers and their shores,
9	and setting this balance will clearly promote
10	redevelopment of parcels that presently detract from
11	optimal use of our waterfronts while still maintaining
12	our valuable and rare natural riverfront areas. Thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
15	Morris, and if you just hold your seat and we'll hear
16	from Mr. Woodworth.
17	MR. MORRIS: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And then ask
19	questions.
20	MR. WOODWORTH: Good evening, Madam Chair.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to turn on
22	that microphone for us.
23	MR. WOODWORTH: There we go. Good
24	evening, Madam Chair and members of the Commission.
25	My name is Jim Woodworth from the National Resources

Planning, I ask that Office of Planning specifically

Defense Council. My comments this evening are based on an October 18<sup>th</sup> memo from Andrew Altman. I have not had an opportunity to actually review the draft as presented tonight. I will attempt to summarize my written comments I submitted to you.

Incidentally, I received the memo not directly from Joel, but from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, so I have not had the pleasure of speaking with Mr. Lawson directly about this, and I look forward to, hopefully, in the future.

I submitted a few other items of paper, not to inundate you, but one is a GIS Overlay from the D.C. Department of Health with respect to steep slopes in D.C. Another is a draft document concerning Chesapeake Bay goals. It is a draft document concerning riparian force buffers in the Chesapeake Watershed, and the last, which I only submitted one copy of, because it's a fairly lengthy document, is a technical and scientific review from Portland, Oregon concerning riparian buffer areas, which is referenced in my comments.

I would like to start off by saying that we applaud the Office of Planning's efforts for taking a proactive role in managing development on the Anacostia Waterfront. We think that this proposal

improved greatly on all the existing waterfront districts, District zones currently in existence.

However, we suggest that this could be improved in several ways, and my comments will be tailored to two specific areas of improvement. We realize that no amount of regulatory language will limit development. If a city is willing to do development, we will find ways to do that, and that's why we have variances and why we have the special exception uses and whatnot.

However, we think it is really important that there be clear, environmentally sound site plan standards for all development within the W-O Zone definition. We want to encourage appropriate development standards.

The two areas I want to emphasize are the setback. We feel the 20 foot setback is inadequate. It is not based on science. It is not based on ecology. We understand that certain development is appropriate on the waterfront. I dated a rower and athletic coach. I have been on the water. I have spent a lot of time in boats. My comments do not pertain to boathouses, but they pertain to the functionality of a buffer where appropriate, and our comments get into a bit of detail about the need to

account for slope and soil type in defining buffers, and we have a recipe here. This is based on the Department of Health recommendations that they submitted for the Urban Forestry Bill that went before the council over the past year.

We feel these are important as my colleague from the Sierra Club mentioned managing runoff into the river. We need to redevelop this waterfront, but we need to do this in a way that does not further impede our restoration goals for the waterfront. We're talking about clean water, fishing and swimming and future goals.

Yes, we need to bring people down. We need to increase access. We need to bring certain categories in the list of special uses here, but we need to do this in a way that does not continue to exacerbate our water quality problem. So I recommend that the Commission examine our recommendations for a buffer.

The second area is with respect to -- it's actually directly with respect to a proposed text in this proposal, and that is that we require specific low impact development, actually as Bob mentioned early, for any development that is on there, so we're managing runoff from all the parking lots, all the

1	roofs, etcetera, in a way that does not wash
2	pollutants into the river.
3	And we recommend, and I think my comments
4	actually pertain specifically to Section 905, Planning
5	Office Review, which I have just briefly glanced at.
6	We have eight suggestions here in terms of additional
7	information that we feel developers should provide the
8	Zoning Commission before they are allowed to do
9	development, and that includes information about flood
10	lanes.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to wrap it
12	up now.
13	MR. WOODWORTH: Okay. Well, I can end
14	there.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, we appreciate
16	you making specific recommendations, because that is
17	very helpful to us, so we look forward to reading your
18	submission.
19	MR. WOODWORTH: Thank you for the
20	opportunity to speak with you.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
22	questions for these gentlemen? Thank you both for
23	coming down tonight.
24	MR. MORRIS: Thank you.
25	MR. WOODWORTH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks. Now, anyone else who wants to testify in support before we move to the case in opposition? All right. Now, I see a lot of people, not everyone, who signed up in opposition, but a lot of people from the Capital Yacht Club, and I would just ask that there not be redundant testimony. So if you hear something that you want to say and you just want to endorse it, you can just introduce yourself and say I would like to endorse the comments of, you know, my neighbor or whomever.

Is there someone here who is officially representing the Capital Yacht Club who is going to take the five minutes? Sir, why don't we start with you, and then let me also ask, and then we'll get to the rest of the folks from the Capital Yacht Club, Mr. Oppmann, Municipal Fish Wharf Lessees, why don't you come down now, Eastern Powerboat, Dean Lindsey? Okay. We will start with you folks and, sir, I am sorry, I don't know your name.

MR. NOLAN: Guy Nolan.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you turn on the mike there for me, Mr. Nolan, Guy Nolan? Okay. You will have five. Each of these gentlemen will have five minutes, so we will start with Mr. Nolan first.

MR. NOLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. The

proposed text amendments created a W-O Open Space Zone. It appeared to be a very useful tool to provide low density, low intensity zone. However, there are several aspects of the proposal, which seem inconsistent with its intent.

These inconsistencies and a December 2002 memo from the Office of Planning indicate the intent to apply this new Open Space Zone to a high density area are very concerning to us. The following summary of our concerns, and my written testimony will have more details on these. I will try to summarize things, and I will skip over the concerns that have already been addressed this evening.

We see no reason why a low density W-0 Open Space Zone should be used in areas where it is obvious that the proposed redevelopment will require much higher density. We are also concerned that granting special exceptions achieves the same effect as zoning businesses on a case by case basis with no oversight and no public involvement.

We believe it is inappropriate to define an existing business when this text change does not yet apply to any defined area. The definition of an existing business should be based on the date that particular area was rezoned.

We do not understand the idea of the option of grandfathering a business based on the master business license instead of the Certificate of Occupation. We have identified questions relating to the issuing of certificates of occupation that must be answered before the proposed regulations would come into effect, and Mr. Johnson described those earlier concerning the docks and whether they are supposed to have certificates of occupancy.

We do not understand the need to restrict a percent of floating homes and believe the number of floating homes should be increased as part of the mayor's intention to increase the District's population and the partnership that, again, Mr. Johnson had mentioned earlier.

We believe that the restriction of the use of a yacht club's clubhouse, so it can only be used for the members themselves would prevent yacht clubs like ours from hosting community events that we believe make us a vital part of the waterfront community.

We would like to point out that decisions beyond our control with respect to the development of the waterfront may occasionally make it impossible for our clubhouse, in particular, to be located directly

in front of our docks as is being required by these regulations. As an example, in Southwest Waterfront, at this point, no one knows where our clubhouse may be as part of the redevelopment.

We would also like to point out that the notice requirements of the proposed changed Chapter 6, of these regulations, were not complied with, and that this portion of the amendment should not be considered and should be removed from this proposal, at this time.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you repeat that? I missed it.

MR. NOLAN: Chapter 6.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. NOLAN: Apparently, that was an oversight of some sort. In conclusion, I believe it is safe for me to say that the members of the Capital Yacht Club would support the creation of a W-O Open Space Zone if it were being used as a low density, low impact, low height area.

However, if our perception that the W-0 Zone is to be used in the area of the Southwest Waterfront redevelopment, if that perception is correct, we believe this would be inappropriate. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank 2 you, Mr. Nolan. Mr. Oppmann? 3 Thank you, Madam Chair and MR. OPPMANN: members of the Commission. I have a testimony in 5 It consists of two pages, which basically writing. for clarification given 6 the fact that the property of the people whom I represent 8 Municipal Fish Wharf are on federal property, and I 9 attach a three page Report of Title, which indicates 10 that it is federal property. It is my understanding that such federal 11 12 property would not be subject to the W-O proposal, and I would like to ask for written confirmation or 13 clarification of that from the Commission. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. MR. OPPMANN: So I have four minutes and 16 15 seconds left. Is that correct? 17 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. 19 MR. OPPMANN: Okay. Thank you. I would 20 like to mention a few other things that have come to 21 my attention, which I think are appropriate to bring 22 up, at this time. When I was asked if I were in favor 23 or not in favor of the proposal, I didn't know what to 24 say and I said well, I guess I am not in favor of it, 25 because there are existing questions given the way the

process worked in this.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My clients were not included in any of the Office of Planning sessions that led up to this and it bothers them, because they are one of the oldest businesses if not the oldest business the They have been there for over 200 years waterfront. National Geographic did a nice article selling fish. on them last July and so forth. The Washington Post has written about how important they are to the city.

To be left out so repeatedly made them wonder what was going on. There is a history of mismanagement at the fish wharf that is really serious, so when people talk about changes, my clients are, I think, understandably gun-shy about this, and the impact on density that the NCRC proposal has, coupled with the diminishment of parking, leads us to have some serious questions about where this whole mess is going.

And I think that the testimony that was given last night at St. Augustine's Church was eloquent testimony to the concerns of the community as to what's going on and how fast it's going, and how seldom they have been included in this.

So that there is some time left for questions, I would like to say just one last thing.

Mr. Lawson, I believe, began by saying that many of these sites involved here tonight are owned by the National Park Service. Did I understand you correctly, Mr. Lawson or someone?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Actually you should

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Actually, you should just make your statements.

MR. OPPMANN: Okay. And Ms. Blumenthal, Linda Blumenthal from the National Park Service testified that there has been work between the AWI Initiative and the Office of Planning. I am concerned to see a member of the National Park Service on the Board of the Zoning Commission, and I would ask that the entire Commission -- what this appearance creates in the public eye, there are many issues that are going to involve Park Service land, and I think that recusal may be an appropriate way to deal with this.

I bring this up, so that it is clear that this is a fair and fully disclosed operation. I don't do so lightly, but this was a point I was trying to make on a procedural basis earlier on, and I apologize if I stepped on the rules of the committee. I had no intention to do so.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, that's fine.

MR. OPPMANN: I would also, lastly, like to say Mr. Bastida and Ms. Sanchez have been very

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

helpful to me today and I appreciate it. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Glad to hear it. Ιf 3 you could just hold your seat there and we will get the questions in a moment, and then Mr. Lindsey? 5 MR. LINDSEY: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair 6 and fellow commissioners. I wasn't aware I was going to be up here for five minutes today and my laptop 8 crashed. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, you're not 10 compelled to take five minutes. MR. LINDSEY: But I will take as much as I 11 12 can and I don't need my glasses now. My name is Dean 13 Lindsey and I represent Eastern Powerboat Club. are probably one of the oldest clubs at the beginning 14 15 of the Anacostia River, and probably now one of the 16 most notorious clubs. We're still trying to get rid of Trafficant's boat down there. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He doesn't need it 19 right now I don't think. 20 MR. LINDSEY: We're fully in support of 21 the W-O plan as it was outlined by the ANC with the 22 amendments and some of the tweaks that they can place 23 into the plan. We have been supportive of the Green 24 Marina Initiative and we're very, very active in that

We have been very

program.

25

the

supportive of

Anacostia Initiative Program.

We're on board with just about everything that is presented to us, because we are a small marina and we have to stand proud, and that means we got to stand tall and act quick. But as the plan is laid out right now, I do believe that the Eastern Powerboat Organization, which represents about 30, 35 members, will stand behind it and stand behind the changes that have been proposed, and look forward in working with it and hope that it remains pure.

If it starts becoming diluted and they start mixing it up and things like that after exchanges are made, then we have got a whole new can of worms, but if it rings pure, then we're behind it 100 percent. That's all I have, no more of your time.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you. Questions for these gentlemen, Mr. Parsons?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Oppmann, how are you?

MR. OPPMANN: Fine, thank you, Mr. Parsons. How are you?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: We have worked together in the past. I think I should respond to your concern. Certainly, if the National Park Service comes forward with a proposal to zone a piece of land

	chac they now own, I will recuse myself.
2	I did not feel that was appropriate in the
3	generic context of this map amendment that we're
4	working on tonight text amendment that we're
5	working on here tonight, because it doesn't
6	specifically apply to any of the lands of the Federal
7	Government. I don't know if that makes you
8	comfortable, but that's would I would intend to do in
9	the future.
10	MR. OPPMANN: You say it doesn't apply to
11	any of the specific lands. Couldn't it apply to all
12	of them?
13	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Only if the federal
14	agency came forward to suggest that they wanted to be
15	subject to zoning.
16	MR. OPPMANN: Okay.
17	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Which makes your
18	point earlier, that you are on federal land, so you
19	should not be subject to this. I think that was your
20	point.
21	MR. OPPMANN: Exactly, that's my
22	understanding.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, on that point,
24	it's my understanding that federal property for
25	federal use is not subject to zoning, but federal

97 property for private use is subject to zoning. am going to ask Mr. Bastida to follow-up with corporation counsel and have them give you the definitive answer, because I am sure you would want to hear that from an attorney. MR. OPPMANN: Absolutely. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Rather than just me. MR. OPPMANN: And, Madam Chair, if we could get that in writing, we would appreciate that. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Bastida will assist you in getting something in writing. MR. OPPMANN: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And believe me, the other commissioners thought that of  ${\tt Mr.}$ 

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And believe me, if any of the other commissioners thought that Mr. Parsons was not appropriately with us, we would say so. I think we all agree that unless there is a specific proposal before us, it's appropriate that Mr. Parsons join us in the deliberation. So thank you for voicing the concern.

MR. OPPMANN: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And giving Mr.

Parsons an opportunity to perhaps set other people's minds at ease, as well. A couple of questions for Mr.

Nolan and maybe a couple of comments, too, and I will start with one of the comments.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I believe that you may have a misunderstanding about what this special exception is, because I believe you had a concern that it did not include public participation when, in fact, it is a public process. It takes place before a different board, but it is a process just like this in the public. There is notice given, ANCs get involved and so forth, so that is a public process.

You raised a good point about the date on which the business was in existence. That is a good I did not quite follow your point. point. After Mr. Johnson had explained to us that some of the -- I don't know, it's the live-aboards or whoever, I don't know who has the business license first, it's the Certificate of Occupancy, but that we needed acknowledge both and I thought you were suggesting that we should not be acknowledging the business licenses. Wе should be focusing exclusively on certificates of occupancy.

Did I misunderstand you?

MR. NOLAN: No, you did misunderstand me.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. NOLAN: I can't speak for Mr. Johnson, of course.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

99
MR. NOLAN: I do think it's inconsistent
to rely on a business license, which has nothing to do
with zoning. Zoning is keyed, my understanding, to
the Certificate of Occupancy, and it seems that that
should be the document that decides one way or another
when the business came into existence.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. And I
think I got the rest of your points, and if any of you
had anything to submit in writing, I know we got
something from Mr. Oppmann, but, Mr. Nolan, if you had

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Just a quickie for Mr. Lindsey. I just wanted some clarification. I understand whose position you're taking and I have the document that you provided, but the fact that the marinas are on federal property will exempt them from zoning considerations, but they are subject to District for health and other agency requirements. Is that so?

any written testimony, we would appreciate getting

that. Anyone else have any questions? Mr. Hannaham?

MR. OPPMANN: Are you directing your question to me or --

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: I was just asking.

You may be exempt from zoning, because you are located on federal lands, but you are subject to

100 Department of Health requirements and other Government agencies, regulatory agencies? MR. OPPMANN: Yes, we have regular federal and --

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Federal and D.C. health.

MR. OPPMANN: -- D.C. health inspections. I'm sorry, I wasn't ready.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Ι I'm sorry. didn't mean to --

MR. OPPMANN: It's quite all right. That's correct. I should say that last week was 90 years that Congress officially declared that piece of property to be a fish wharf, 1913, 62<sup>nd</sup> Congress, and that's a restricted use down there. So whether that constitutes a federal purpose or not may remain to be seen, but we would be glad to provide you -- I have a copy of the act right here in my briefcase, and I would be glad to get a copy to the Commission of the legislation, which set it up as a federal fish wharf, as well as the Supreme Court decision on the entire waterfront, which presumably you have, Morris v. <u>United States</u> from 1899, a 160 page decision before the Supreme Court ruling on the Supreme Court to which our title report refers, the very first paragraph.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: What was the
2	ruling of the Supreme Court? What was the case?
3	MR. OPPMANN: Morris, M-O-R-R-I-S, versus
4	United States, 1899, meeting of the court. They found
5	that the entire waterfront from Fort McNair to the $14^{ ext{th}}$
6	Street Bridge to be federal property, there were some
7	people trying to claim it as private property and that
8	decision is considered the landmark ruling on that
9	part of what was in the Potomac River and is now the
10	Washington Channel, which may or may not be of help.
11	It's a long, rather dusty decision, but it, you know,
12	is what is looked to as
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, since none of
14	us are lawyers, we probably wouldn't enjoy it.
15	MR. OPPMANN: I wouldn't recommend it
16	unless you want to sleep.
17	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: But I would if you
18	could provide us with a copy of the legislation that
19	you mentioned.
20	MR. OPPMANN: Surely, I would be glad to.
21	I will get that down tomorrow by fax.
22	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay.
23	MR. OPPMANN: It's only one page.
24	COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: That's fine. I
25	would appreciate that.

MR. OPPMANN: Surely. COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Thank you. 2 3 MR. OPPMANN: Thank you. COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Thank you, Madam 5 Chair. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 6 Anyone else, anyone questions? All right. Thank you, 8 gentlemen. I don't know what POWYC is, although, it's 9 some kind of yacht club, I bet. Mr. Grubaugh, why 10 don't you come down, and we also have Liz Grubaugh from GPSA, which I take it is a different group, all 11 12 right, and Eric Slaughter from Capital Yacht Charters. 13 Mr. Slaughter? Oh, okay. Why don't we start with 14 you, Mr. Grubaugh, and you will have five minutes. 15 MR. GRUBAUGH: Madam Chairman and 16 committee members, thank you very much for 17 opportunity to address the zoning issue in public 18 I rise in opposition to the zoning issue. 19 have to ask a couple of questions as I go along, 20 because there is a concern. 21 Last night in a public forum in which the 22 Southwest Development Plan was presented, which also 23 came out of the Office of Planning, Mr. Parsons was there to represent the National Park Service in that 24

forum to those of us from the public that also

attended that forum, and this same Office of Planning, of course, is introducing this zoning regulation, which was talked about extensively last night, as well, in the context of the redevelopment of the Southwest Waterfront.

So that is why there is a lot of ambition, if you will, or concern of the application of the W-O Zoning Requirements to the Southwest Waterfront as it currently exists, so I just wanted to bring that to the Chair's attention.

We applaud the attempt at the zoning of undeveloped areas along the Washington Waterfront and we applaud the additional planning and development land side in the southwest district. We are concerned about the encroachment on the actual waterway itself.

And what I would like to point out is in the presentations, and the artists' conceptions of the display that was given this evening, one of examples given of one of the exceptions was boat that, the display that construction, and in was Commission to this that of, presented was approximately, a 14 foot wooden dory being built in an And in fact, that language was brought to the area. Planning, I believe, by the Office of National Maritime Heritage Foundation who wanted it in this

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Zoning Regulation, so they can build a 100 foot tall ship in that area.

Also, the Office of Planning and the National Capital Revitalization Commission is currently discussing building that tall ship right there in southwest right next to the Gangplank Marina between the channel in and the current Zanzibar Club. So the addition of a new shipyard in a residential area becomes questionable as to why this Zoning Regulation is being put forward. So these are some of the concerns we have.

I would also like to point out, and although you don't have opportunity to view it right now, the proposal that was presented in the Southwest Waterfront last night, in each and every one of the artist depictions of the boats in the channel, none of the boats are large enough to be live-aboards, which means just the live-aboard population would disappear just like the Capital Yacht Club disappeared from all the planning documents, hypothetically.

It's kind of hard to understand why the District in a time that we're looking at budget shortfalls, this, that and the other, would want to deplete a tax base or get rid of a tax base, you know. Those of us that live down there, we pay our taxes in

the District. We pay our car tags in the District. We pay our groceries, you know, or do our regular economic basis right here in the District. So I kind of have trouble understanding why that would be done.

So it's the same Office of Planning presenting this W-O Zoning Regulation here tonight that also presented that plan to us last night. So right, wrong or indifferent, it's almost like I understand you're an independent Commission and you're only looking at the zoning as it's being presented to you, but when you look at the entire picture, that's where we get some grave concerns.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand.

MR. GRUBAUGH: And again, just one of the things I wanted to point out. So we are opposed to it in its current form. If it strictly was applicable to the undeveloped areas, no problem, but the ability to come in and rezone an existing area causes concern, Port of Washington Yacht Club. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Grubaugh. Ms. Grubaugh?

MS. GRUBAUGH: Yes, my name is Liz Grubaugh. I am representing the Gangplank Slipholders Association. I am a resident of the Gangplank Marina

here in southwest. While we want to welcome both land side filament in protecting our natural resources, it should not be at the expense of the watermen and those that chose the aquatic lifestyle.

I am concerned that the city chooses not to recognize us as a community and wants to place restrictions they would not attempt to in a landborne residential area. I am deeply concerned about ambiguous language within the proposed W-O Zoning proposal before us.

In some areas, it addresses grandfathering existing business, such as those in the Washington Channel and proceeds to negate that language, which references to the marinas as a matter-of-right in W-1, W-2 and W-3 as long as they are in accordance with the Section 900, the W-0 verbiage.

They restrict the ability to live aboard for those of us who choose to do so to a clandestine percentage predicted on some unknown facts. Why restrict the tax base and reduce the amount of generated income to the local economy and place in it transients who may or may not come to the southwest and the waterfront based on the weather security or the slow economy?

It would also restrict the many marina

businesses required to ensure comfortable and safe boating in the Washington Channel, including minor repairs, canvas upholstery and manufacture. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And Mr. Slaughter?

MR. SLAUGHTER: Yes, thank you very much.

I am Eric Slaughter. I am the owner of Capital Yacht
Charters. We have two charter yachts operating off of
Washington Channel. We make use of a number of
marinas on other coastal areas in the watershed,
Washington, D.C.

I was going to talk about one of the things that other people have already said. I do want to support my ANC commissioner in full, but I do have one question that maybe you can clarify for me. It has been implied, I believe, that federal properties not necessarily would be covered by the W-O unless a specific action came forward where a private holder was going to become involved.

But there is at least one parcel, maybe others, on our waterfront where the federal ownership has been retained. However, through a special act, the District is the managing entity of that property and is in charge of its leases. However, the title

1	has not been transferred, and I am curious as to
2	whether the W-O would apply to those properties, as
3	well or not.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What is the use being
5	made of the property?
6	MR. SLAUGHTER: It's a marina, it's a
7	marina. It's an existing marina.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think in some
9	circumstances we have property that is federally owned
10	and it is now in private use, and unless there is some
11	change to that use or it is expanded, zoning doesn't
12	become an issue.
13	MR. SLAUGHTER: Thank you.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just because it is
15	sort of you know, no change triggers nothing, so
16	it's just status quo in those situations.
17	MR. SLAUGHTER: Thank you, thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any questions for
19	this panel?
20	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I just
21	wanted to ask Mr. Grubaugh. Did I pronounce your name
22	right, Grubaugh?
23	MR. GRUBAUGH: Yes, sir
24	VICE CHAIR HOOD: You mentioned the ship.
25	What is the subject matter of the ship? What kind of

ship is it?

MR. GRUBAUGH: Yes, sir, the ship enterprise. It's a 100 foot sailing vessel to give us a tall ship much like the Pride of Baltimore. In fact, I believe it's built on the same plans as the Pride of Baltimore, and they also have in their far reaching plans the opportunity to build a second ship, and that would be a replica of the Pearl, which as we know was the slave ship that left the 7<sup>th</sup> Street docks back in the 1800s.

Both of these ships would be built at that facility if that were provided for and approved, and that's why it was put into this Zoning Regulation. So we're not talking about a little 14 foot dory that was shown to the Commission here on their photograph, and I think it's only fair to point these things out to the Commission as they review this. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Let me ask you a question. This whole waterfront initiative has been going on for some time. Were you involved with the process? Notwithstanding the W-O, but before the W-O even came up as a proposal, were you involved with the process all the way through? When did you come on board?

MR. GRUBAUGH: Sir, I have been involved

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

110
with the process, because I am the individual that
sued the previous owners of the marina for
depreciating the value of the marina at the expense of
the landholders down there, at which time a consortium
of owners down there, boat owners, wanted to attempt
to buy the marina and upgrade the marina and make it a
classy project. In the stead of doing that, the NCRC
took the property.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay.
MR. GRUBAUGH: And now comes down with
these grandiose plans at the expense of those of us
that are down there, but yes, sir, I have been

involved in this for a long time.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: That was all I wanted to know. You gave me a little more than what I -- I was just curious. The other two, have you all been involved with this process? Well, I am sure you have, Ms. Grubaugh, but --

MR. SLAUGHTER: Yes, sir, very much. have been in the waterfront since 1979 and I have been very active and supportive of the Office of Planning's efforts.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

> Thank you. Anyone CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

else, questions? Mr. Hannaham?

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Thank you, Madam Just a quickie follow-up to the ships. Chairman. What is so peculiar about their being constructed in southwest Washington? Could they be constructed someplace else? mean, what is the special Ι association with southwest Washington the construction site?

MR. GRUBAUGH: I don't know and I would agree with you 100 percent, sir, except the presentation has been made and I have escorted the people up on the operation line up there at the site. It has been explained that they are in current negotiations with the NCRC as soon as they can get it zoned and get it prepared to build a tall ship there. It's no secret. Eric knows it, you know.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think Mr. Grubaugh's point is when you think of a boat building, don't just think of a small boat, and he wants us to think about compatibility of the variety of uses that would be permitted in this zone, and whether or not building a large ship is appropriate.

MR. GRUBAUGH: The point I'm getting at, sir, in a current residential area, which I am sure you probably live in --

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Right.

MR. GRUBAUGH: I think you would probably raise a red flag if somebody come in next door and decided to build a 100 foot wooden boat next to you, which meant a little pounding and sawing and this, that and the other and things of that magnitude. We are not considered a residential area by the city. They don't even treat us like a community, so they think they can do whatever they want to down there.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: That was why I was asking the question, because I thought there probably are other places that will probably be more suitable.

I was just wondering what was so special or unique about that particular location for the construction.

MR. GRUBAUGH: It might be a good question to ask if that request for zoning comes up.

COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Is there educational or historical or benefits to be derived from this thing?

MR. GRUBAUGH: Yes, sir, it will be used as an educational purpose with the city. My understanding is the idea is to build the Pearl, which will be utilized and pretty much stationed here within the District, and the Spirit of Enterprise will then be stationed here in the District, but will go up and

down the Chesapeake and the coast and the various call representing the District 2 ports of and 3 fundraising activities, things of that magnitude. COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: So this will be a 5 District Government sponsored --MR. GRUBAUGH: I believe it's a private 6 7 enterprise. 8 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. 9 GRUBAUGH: I don't believe it's MR. 10 necessarily District Government sponsored. 11 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. 12 MR. GRUBAUGH: My understanding is they have to raise 5 million dollars for matching funds. 13 14 COMMISSIONER HANNAHAM: Okay. Thank you 15 very much. 16 MR. GRUBAUGH: Yes, sir. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Thank you 18 all for coming down tonight. Okay. Mr. Barr, William 19 Barr and Steven Cohn, Cohn, sorry, Janet Miles. Now, 20 each of you will have three minutes. Yes, ma'am. Now, Madam Chair, 21 MR. BARR: 22 I won't take my three minutes. My points have been 23 very well represented by Mr. Johnson and Commodore I will just add that the points, the major Nolan. 24 25 point hurdling, stumbling block I had was squaring the

zoning proposal with other plans for the waterfront, as so many people have also expressed, and I am not sure if there is any coordination there at all.

I just want to emphasize that, you know, following the meeting last night, if you all had watched Channel 9, you would hear that construction could start as soon as 18 months from today on demolition on the waterfront, and that sounds kind of ominous to us.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you. Mr. Cohn?

MR. COHN: Cohn, right, thank you. I think I support the comments made by Mr. Nolan also said in opposition to the plan or the zoning plan. I wanted to reflect some of the things that Mr. Morris from Sierra Club said about the water runoff and some of the things that you overlooked was that the Capital Yacht Club has supported the Environmental Protection Agency with this Storm Water Runoff Plan.

And he overlooked that point that every entity on the waterfront has to have that plan and the Capital Yacht Club has that plan and supported the Green Marina Initiative. The club has also been in existence since 1892. We are a historic landmark, but the building itself is not, and that is all I have to

say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Cohn.

And, Ms. Miles, I need you to turn on that microphone for me.

MS. MILES: Okay. Thank you. My name is Janet Miles and I am a proud member of the Capital Yacht Club community and have been a member since 1992. I am speaking today representing the members who could not be here and the larger Washington Waterfront community who are deeply concerned about these zoning changes.

I am concerned about the possibility of spot zoning, a highly unethical process by which local communities, such as ours, are displaced to make room for commercial special interests. The Capital Yacht Club is more than a collection of boats. As Mr. Cohn said, we are a community that stretches back 111 years, and I am here to make sure that our historic organization is respected.

It seems that the only reason to apply the W-O regs to this zone is to demolish property values for easy condemnation. And moreover, D.C. Official Code 641.02 states that the regulations should encourage stability of land values.

Obviously, a W-O Zone in southwest will

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

have a devastating affect on land values. Let me repeat that the Capital Yacht Club members are paying close attention to the possibility of spot zoning, a practice that we understand to be improper, if not illegal.

And then there is the basic fairness to our community. The retroactive effect in 11 DCMR 901.6 is illegal and inconsistent with the statute and existing regulations. I want to repeat the testimony of others that the D.C. Official Code Section 6-641.06A states that a lawful use of a building or premises preexisting the adoption of a regulation is lawful.

It is clear that the language does not allow for retroactive application of a zoning regulation. We thank you for hearing our concerns, my concerns on this matter. You have our promise that we are paying close attention to this matter, and we trust that you will be fair to our community as this process continues to unfold. Thank you very much for listening.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms. Miles.

Any questions for this panel, any questions? All right. Thank you all for coming down. Michael Ellison, Thomas Rainy, it looks like. Pardon me?

MR. ELLISON: He will not be speaking.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, will not be speaking? Thank you. Will Whitehouse, Will Whitehouse, oh, sorry, Scott Schramm. We will start with you, Mr. Ellison, whenever you're ready.

MR. ELLISON: Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, I would like to say that I personally support the overall plan that is being proposed by the Office of Planning. What I do not support is how it is handled and being handled in the Southwest Waterfront.

So the question I have got is why are we here? I mean, afterall, rezoning of W-O would have actually no effect at all, because all of the business that are on the Southwest Waterfront as they stand actually conform to the special exemptions that we would have to apply for if it were rezoned.

So what is the effect of this? Why is this happening? It seems that there is an alternate agenda. Just as an example, it resorts to current businesses to apply for special exemptions, so why has this been requested? The Office of Planning's lack of communication with the current waterfront businesses and their official actions are frightening to us all.

As an example, as you already heard, the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Capital Yacht Club has been on the waterfront for 111 years. The current proposed rezoning action, as it stands, has already injured them by forcing their tenant to leave due to the uncertainty of the future.

That same uncertainly is going to make finding another tenant difficult. Just by the fact that this meeting is taking place, we have been injured. The value of the land has been depreciated to that effect. We have a lease that is still running for 60 years. We should have something to say about what's going on here, but we have not been contacted until yesterday by the Office of Planning. So have we had anything to input? No, we have not. We are concerned.

Look at the proposal as it stands. There are open spaces down there now in the waterfront. There is park land. The parks are not maintained. There is trash strewn everyplace. Members of our yacht club pick it up. We have even put out our own trash bins, because the trash situation is so critical down there.

Why should we expect that anything else is going to change? If you designate more park land, will it be taken care of? I don't think so. Look around, the city is broke. Where is the money going

to come from to cut more grass, to pick up more trash, 2 to do this construction? Yet, if these proposals go through, the effect, the destruction of businesses, 5 destruction of ways of life will have already taken place before "the money can't be found." 6 southwest is already a very wide promenade, a 40 foot 8 wide promenade along the Washington Channel. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to wrap it 10 You're just down to your last few seconds. MR. ELLISON: Okay. Essentially, what I 12 am saying is to Mr. Hood in particular. You want 13 solutions? The solution is that this proposal as it It is not 14 pertains to southwest is not complete. 15 whole and it shouldn't even have been presented to 16 Send it back. Send it back to the Office of you. 17 Planning to have some of these questions answered. Then bring it forward again and consider it. 18 19 you. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. 21 Ellison. Mr. Whitehouse? 22 MR. WHITEHOUSE: Good evening, Madam 23

Chair, members of the Commission. My name is Will Whitehouse and I am a member of the Capital Yacht

Club, and I have been active down on the Washington

9

11

24

Waterfront for the past 23 years, and had a presence there almost on a daily basis.

Over the past 23 years, I have seen many changes. Yet, one thing that has remained consistent is the live-aboard community, which is really unique down on this waterfront, particularly at the Gangplank Marina. The benefits of this community are twofold to the area at large.

You have first the security of the local area here. We mean the boats and the people who live in the area. In past winters when we had very cold winters, residents saved 11 boats from sinking in one day, whereas over at other marinas that were non liveaboards, they had multiple whole losses all the way down, environmental impact, everything. They also police the area and keep it very clean. If anybody puts anything in the water, we're the first ones to make a phone call, because we don't like our area dirtied up.

The second thing is Homeland Security protection, which is a new dimension that has come out of this. The Coast Guard has implemented Eyes on the Potomac Program down here, and so in regards to maintaining vigilance on the infrastructure, bridges, river and so forth, our transportation.

We know what's there. We know who belongs there. We watch and, I mean, we watch like crazy, and as the chair of the security committee for Capital Yacht Club, we have, for example, just us, put a camera system in where we can watch our whole area and videotape it. And we have close relationship with the D.C. Police, both on the boats down there, first district and the fire department down there.

So really enclosing on this the thing that others say is that to limit the live-aboard community down there is to limit the level of security as an asset in this area, which is more like an extension of a beat cop who knows his people. That's it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Whitehouse. And Mr. Schramm?

MR. SCHRAMM: Good evening, Madam Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Scott Schramm. I am a proud member of the Capital Yacht Club, as well as a resident of the District of Columbia. I can only echo the concerns that we have heard so far from my fellow yacht club members about W-O proposed land changes and what it will do to land values and diminished land values in our area.

Our concern, I think, comes from probably

what you have heard so far from some of the presentations we have seen from the NCRC and some of their proposed changes that simply eliminate us from the picture. What will happen to us? What will happen to our clubhouse? What will happen to our community that has been spoken of this evening? This is a plan.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sorry, they didn't reset the clock.

MR. SCHRAMM: I can only echo the fact that our club has been in existence for 111 years, and we are part of the maritime history of this area. Eliminating this would be a gross injustice, and we can only see fear, at this point, of W-0 being imposed against us to potentially eliminate us from the overall development plan. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any questions for this panel. I understand the concern that you have, because what you are seeing is this very large proposal, and we are focusing tonight on just a potential tool to be used in certain places, and at the moment, our Commission is only thinking about this tool. We're not thinking about all the things that you are concerned about. So we're sensitive to the things that you are saying, but there

are just certain limitations on this process.

MR. ELLISON: We understand that it's only a tool for the future and again, we agree with the future, but the tool can be used as a weapon, as well, and we were just looking for assurances that it will not and cannot be used as a weapon against us. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I am not sure you can get those assurances from the Commission. If we choose to create the zoning category to begin with, then it will be again on a case by case basis where we choose to map it, and you have heard things here tonight that would suggest that it would be difficult to map it in an area, as Mr. Gross said, that is in the comprehensive plan currently designated for low density commercial, that that would be inconsistent and we are not allowed to map things that are inconsistent.

MR. ELLISON: Exactly, ma'am, but remove the Southwest Waterfront from that overall zoning W-0 Plan. That's all it would take.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, fine. Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Ellingsworth, Mr. Kennedy, Peter Kennedy and I think we actually have four seats up there, Andrea Storie and Marvin Storie,

1	one or both of you.
2	MS. STORIE: My comments were covered by
3	Mr. Grubaugh and Mr. Lindsey.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Mr. Storie
5	then, you need to come up to the table, because we
6	need to get you on the mike, and I would just say
7	that, for the record, that Ms. Storie was just
8	associating herself with the comments of others, so
9	that we get your notion on the record there. So we
10	will begin with Mr. Ellingsworth, and just so that Ms.
11	Sanchez knows, is she there?
12	MR. BASTIDA: She has left.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. When it's Mr.
14	Storie's turn, he is representing a different yacht
15	club. This is a yacht club that
16	MR. STORIE: That's correct.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
18	MR. STORIE: District Yacht Club, and
19	actually the Potomac River Boating Association.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. When it's your
21	turn, we will give you five minutes then. Go ahead,
22	Mr. Ellingsworth.
23	MR. ELLINGSWORTH: Thank you, Madam
24	Chairman. My name is William Ellingsworth. I, too,
25	am a member of the Capital Yacht Club and I have had a

presence on the Washington Waterfront in southwest for 23 years.

I agree, and I am not going to go into my statement, because I agree with virtually everyone who has spoken out in opposition to the W-O Zoning. I think that there may be some misunderstanding from what I am hearing that why we're concerned, we're bringing up a lot of points, but the points are that our future is somewhat uncertain and we feel that the W-O Zoning is giving carte blanche to the folks down there that want to move the small businesses, the small community organizations out in favor of larger places, and we are making it easier.

It seems as if a 111 year presence is not important, and we are a major part of the historical Washington Waterfront. We are a part of the community. They have mentioned the things that we are involved in, but these are important things, the Police and Fireman's Picnic, the Cruise for Kids, the Cherry Blossom Parade, the Parade of Lights at Christmas time.

We are one of the reasons that people come to the waterfront to see the boats, and we feel that it would be very nice to have a high rise building with expensive restaurants at the expense of a small

yacht club or a small restaurant, and that is our major concern, that what we're doing is giving carte blanche to these folks to move us out with a W-O Zoning.

And we hope that people will look a little further than a high rise building with an expensive restaurant in it and see that we are part and parcel of the Washington Waterfront community, and for that matter, a part of the entire metropolitan community. We take care of the water that we live on. We take care of the community that we live in, and we hope that that will be kept in mind when you're thinking about W-O Zoning. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Ellingsworth. Mr. Kennedy?

MR. KENNEDY: I am Peter Kennedy. I am a member of Capital Yacht Club, and there is not much else I can say connected with everything else that has been said. However, this may be a tool of yours to use, make good use of the tool. Think of the long range, not just the short range, and that is one thing that I think that really needs to be understood by the panel here is make sure that decisions you make are really ones that you think are good long term, not short term. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. And Mr. Storie?

MR. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Chairman and the members of the Commission. My name is Marvin Storie. I represent the District Yacht Club, one of the Anacostia River clubs, and also the Potomac River Yacht Clubs Association, which represents 21 yacht clubs along the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers.

In general, we are very supportive of the concept of the plan and what Mr. Lawson has done. We have spoken with him and emailed back and forth to him some ideas. He has incorporated several of our thoughts initially. However, we still have concerns with the way it is written and what it has.

It has already been voiced by several and we support what they have said about this problem with the setbacks, and allowing room for the trail bikeway areas in front of these clubs with minimum land space.

Also, in the case of the District Yacht Club, in the case of Eastern Powerboat Club, and of course in the case of the Anacostia Marina, Tommy Long's old facility where you have operating marine railways.

It becomes a very strong safety hazard to have the public going along the riverfront where you have marine railways. It's a real hazard and it's

also a security issue when you have a boat pulled up on a railway and you have the public access to be able to come along in there. So just something to keep in the back of your mind when you look at how this is.

I think the Park Service, National Park Service representative indicated that a suggested direction would be to route this behind the facilities, and this might be considered also for those areas where you have that.

As for the other issues, we support what has been said by Capital Yacht Club and the concerns they all voiced, and I won't go into any of that further. There is no reason to repeat it. I think it has been well said before, and thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Storie. Any questions for this panel? Mr, Parsons?

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Mr. Storie, I guess you have learned here tonight that this would not apply to any of the yacht clubs on the Anacostia, and that they are on federal properties.

MR. STORIE: I understand that, Mr. Parsons. The question there or the worry that we have there is that there have been previous situations where the National Park Service has turned big management, not the ownership, of the property areas

over to -- could be to District of Columbia Government to manage that property.

If that happens, and it's conceivable that that could happen, considering the development plan that Mr. Lawson has shown for going up the Anacostia Riverside, and so that then becomes a serious worry or a concern that they could have if this was a discussion that the District of Columbia and the National Park Service got into in mapping.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Because District property is subject to zoning?

MR. STORIE: That's correct, and also that as the special use permits and the leases, at least the ones that I have seen, the permitees, lessees, have to follow the local regulations. That's in the permit. So if you establish a local regulation, then — and this is normal case.

I just retired from the U.S. Forest Service and I was quite involved in the same type of thing the National Park Service does, and we worked very closely to make sure that the rules that anybody got on with federal property were in parallel and matched up as closely as possible with whatever regulations that the local Government was requiring, and so I could see that being impressed upon.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? VICE CHAIR HOOD: Yes, Madam Chair. Ι just wanted to say, Mr. Ellingsworth, actually, 5 probably should have asked Mr. Ellison. Since he's not at the table, Mr. Ellingsworth, obviously you have 6 had a lot of contact with the exception of 8 whatever went on last night at this meeting. 9 Was that your first time hearing about 10 these proposed regs? MR. ELLINGSWORTH: Well, I have been aware 11 12 of them, but by hearsay from other sources, but have 13 never had any contact with the people in the Planning Commission or with the NCRC. 14 15 VICE CHAIR HOOD: So you haven't had a 16 formal presentation of this? 17 MR. ELLINGSWORTH: No, we have not, and I 18 don't know that the yacht club has officially 19 requested one, but we would certainly, I think, be open to a presentation. As a matter of fact, I do 20 21 know that the commodore of the yacht club, who spoke 22 hear earlier, got his first look at the overall plan 23 last night, and I think that we would have liked to have had a little more time to look at it. 24

HOOD:

CHAIR

VICE

25

Mr.

you,

Thank

Ellingsworth. Mr. Kennedy, you mentioned to make sure
we make good decisions. I can tell you that it's
always good to testify and come down and speak on
issues, because when I looked at the regulations, I
looked at the Waterfront Open Space and Recreation, I
start running my own imagination and it ran wild, but
I can assure you that this Commission, at least from
my standpoint, I am sure my colleagues agree, we don't
take any testimony we heard lightly.
MR. KENNEDY: We certainly hope so.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: We can assure you of
that.
MR. KENNEDY: That's one of our plans.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: I am not saying it's
going to go your way, but I can assure you that
MR. KENNEDY: That's not expected.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: we are not taking
this lightly, because this, what I am hearing tonight,
is definitely a surprise to me.
MR. KENNEDY: So was this. Thank you.
VICE CHAIR HOOD: I guess I owe you one,
but you got
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank
you, gentleman. Erin McKeon and Robert McKeon and

Marian Raup.

MS. RAUP: Raup.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Raup. Go ahead.

MS. McKEON: Good evening. I am Erin McKeon. I lived in Washington, D.C. for 10 years. I have had a boat berthed in the Southwest Waterfront for the past six, first at the Gangplank and now at the Capital Yacht Club. My boat is a classic Criscraft. It is a 1968, 47 foot Criscraft Commander, quite beautiful if I do say so myself. I actually won an honorable mention in the Parade of Lights this last Christmas.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Congratulations.

MS. McKEON: We were very proud of our boat then. I have for the past six years been an active member in the waterfront community. I have also been an elected leader at Capital Yacht where I serve as secretary, as well as a member of the board of directors.

As you have heard, Capital Yacht Club has been around for 111 years and we have a long, distinguished history of community service where we have hosted every single year the Cruise for Kids for the Easter Seals where we take disabled children out and give them rides on boats.

We host annual dinners for the police and

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

firemen, and we have been very active members of the community. We have also signed the Clean Marina Pledge. Every single member here from the yacht club has signed a pledge not to in any way harm the waters on which we live. We have vowed not to discharge any harmful substances into the water, and we have been very much a part of the community.

One of the things that I am most proud about my yacht club and what we do is that we host boats from around the world who come here to visit the city, who come to our marina. Every year, we host any of a number of diplomats and other dignitaries, most notably, in my mind at least, being Eric Clapton brings his beautiful boat into our yacht club at least once every two years.

I do have and I will give for the record a copy of a recent article in <u>Chesapeake Bay Magazine</u> where our yacht club was mentioned as a site deemed to be worthy of visiting in and of itself, that the yacht club is itself a draw to the city, not only the wonderful attractions that we have as being the host to the nation's capital, but also the marina itself.

Unfortunately, in our time in Washington, we have been at times displaced and otherwise moved around by plans to develop the waterfront. We have

been moved in the past. Our clubhouse was demolished for waterfront development plans back in the '70s. Two of our docks were removed in order to make way for the Metro line, and we as a yacht club were displaced at those times. We understood that this was needed for development, and we were happy to give the city the ability to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're going to need to wrap it up, because your time is getting short.

MS. McKEON: The summary of what is going on here is that when we look at the W-O, we think it's great. I imagine what it would look like around Columbia Island, the marina in front of the Pentagon, and if this is actually what you are going to do in the waterfront, we would love it. We just don't buy it. We don't buy it. We don't think that that's what the plan is.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank you. Mr. McKeon?

MR. McKEON: Hi, my name is Robert McKeon. If you look at the Office of Planning memorandum that was recently submitted, you will notice that it says that the zoning shall apply to such lands that are leased, so that they contain private enterprises on federal land.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What are you reading from there?

MR. McKEON: It's section 7, applicable areas, page 3. It's the memorandum from the Office of Planning dated February 28, 2003.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. McKEON: Page 3, section 7. On January 24<sup>th</sup> of this year, the Zoning Commission advertised in the <u>Washington Times</u> that the W-O Zone could apply to Reservation 343 or Parcel 169. Reservation 343 is owned exclusively by the National Park Service. Parcel 169, Lot 111 is owned by WMATA and Pepco.

The Legacy Plan of the National Capitol Planning Commission comprises Phase 1 of Washington Waterfronts. On Page 15 of Phase 1, NCPC calls for the opening of a working boatyard and marina on the west side of the Anacostia where the former Anacostia Marina was located. The proposed regulations contravene such planning of federal interests since the reinstallation of such boatyard and marina would no longer be by right.

In <u>Crystal Bay Marina v. Sweden</u>, 939, Federal Supplement 839, the Court held that a local zoning ordinance, as applied to a marina on federal

land is preempted by the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution. Among the powers unconditionally delegated to Congress by the Property Clause of the U.S. Constitution is the authority to control occupancy and use of public lands. Pursuant to the National Park Service Concessions Management Improvement Act of 1998, the National Park Service is expressly permitted to lease or allow occupancy of its land for uses as regulated by the NPS Act.

Therefore, the proposed regulation as it is intended to apply to Reservation 343 or any other National Park Service land is preempted by federal law. I also would like to add that when they talked about Parcel 169, Parcel 169 is landlocked. It abuts Reservation 343. If the Zoning Regulations can't apply to Reservation 343, then why apply a Waterfront Zoning Regulation to landlocked land? That doesn't make any sense.

The proposed regulation cannot be applied to the Southwest Waterfront due to notice defects in the Washington Times advertisement. If this zone were to apply anywhere else, then interested parties will not have been afforded an opportunity to comment and participate in a regulatory process.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to wrap it

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

up, Mr. McKeon.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McKEON: Okay. In the instance of fairness, it shouldn't apply to southwest. In the other paragraph, I talk about spot zoning. I wrote I talked to Uvey Brandis of the Office of Planning. I asked him if he intended to apply it to southwest. He goes no. Do you still plan on testifying? I said yes. So I emailed him. He is pretty good about emailing, so I emailed him and I said, please, tell me you don't intend to apply this to the Southwest Waterfront. No response. It has been over a week.

In their December memo, as Mr. Johnson stated, they stated specifically that Southwest Waterfront was on the mark for a W-O. I believe that they are after spot zoning, and I just can't believe it, and it is killing our property values. lost the tenant that was very dear to us, and this is just -- we have a picture of our building, of our site, on their website right now as demolished. How are we going to get another tenant? How long is Hogate going to stay vacant? How long is the waterfront going to go down?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. McKEON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

McKeon. And Ms. Raup?

MS. RAUP: My name is Marian Raup. I am a member of the Capital Yacht Club. In fact, I serve on the board of directors. I have been active in the waterfront community for six years and I am a resident of the District. I largely support what has been said here prior to tonight, and I won't take up your time with repeating it.

I have three quick points that I do want to make. We're concerned, as Bob just said, we're concerned about spot zoning. We're concerned that this is an inappropriate zoning to be applied to our area and we're afraid that it's just a ruse to deflate property values and, essentially, take our property.

The second concern we have is that I'm not sure that there is sufficient funding for all the projects that are being proposed for this, and I think it would be a real tragedy to take over the property, demolish what is there and then not have the funding to go further.

And then lastly, I want to support what has been said previously tonight about the live-aboard community. I would like to see the live-aboard density left up to the individual marinas and yacht clubs and not to be regulated through zoning by any

other outfit and, please, don't differentiate between marinas and yacht club with respect to live-aboards. 2 3 Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 5 Any questions for these folks? MS. MCKEON: Can I make a clarification? 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If you turn on your 8 mike, you can, 9 MS. MCKEON: Oh, I got so busy talking 10 about my beautiful boat, I forgot to --I wish you 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: had 12 brought a picture, because I don't know boats, 13 anyway. 14 MS. MCKEON: It's classic, great lines. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 16 MS. MCKEON: But looking here when talking 17 about whether or not federal land applies, perhaps we 18 could all go home and have dinner if it turned out 19 that this, the W-O Zone, could not be applied to the 20 yacht club, because we do sit on federal property that 21 we have leased. And if somebody could clarify whether 22 or not this is the case, because what we are reading 23 if this land is leased and contains a private 24 enterprise, and this was written by the Department of

Planning --

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
2	MS. MCKEON: that it does apply.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's correct.
4	MS. MCKEON: And therefore, it does also
5	apply to Tommy Long's Marina. It does also apply to
6	the Gangplank.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's only if uses are
8	changed. I think I said this earlier in response to
9	someone's concern. If there are private uses on
10	federal property and those uses are not changing or
11	expanding, then the status quo applies. There is no
12	application of zoning. But in the event that someone
13	wants to expand such a use, zoning would be put in
14	place and it would be applied to that expansion.
15	MS. MCKEON: So this would apply to Tommy
16	Long's Marina, because they are talking about
17	significantly changing what was there?
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Presumably, yes. No?
19	Mr. Parsons is saying no.
20	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Because it will
21	continue to be federal property.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But what about the
23	private use?
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It's a concession
25	of the National Park Service.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, that is some
2	kind of well, it actually is true.
3	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It's a contract of
4	a relationship.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, right, it's
6	not
7	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It's not an
8	interest in land.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, it's not a
10	lease. It's a concession and there is some kind of
11	legal distinction, I believe.
12	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes.
13	MR. MCKEON: Madam Chair, may I just ask
14	one thing?
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You got to remember
16	we're not lawyers, and so
17	MR. MCKEON: I just want to say
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I am guessing you
19	are.
20	MR. MCKEON: Yes, and I do know that
21	sometimes I am not going to the notice that they
22	published, and that was published January.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
24	MR. MCKEON: It said Reservation 343.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
ı	

1	MR. MCKEON: Parcel 169.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And as I said to Mr.
3	Johnson, that was published in error. That was a
4	mistake.
5	MR. MCKEON: But that's a public notice,
6	and now people are
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And that's why we had
8	to reschedule. That's why we had to reschedule,
9	because it was renoticed. This hearing was renoticed.
10	MR. MCKEON: It was renoticed on January
11	24 <sup>th</sup> , right?
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, it was renoticed
13	after that. Isn't that correct, Mr. Bastida?
14	MR. MCKEON: February?
15	MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, let me give
16	the gentleman a copy of the revised notice of hearing,
17	which, in fact, does not include any specific site and
18	they are actually by the door, and if there is none
19	available, I will be glad to print one for you.
20	MR. MCKEON: Well, if the newspaper ad is
21	a required notice to the public
22	MR. BASTIDA: Sir, it was revised. That
23	means that the hearing was canceled, because of
24	inappropriate noticing.
25	MR. MCKEON: Okay. Was the newspaper ad

1	readvertised?
2	MR. BASTIDA: Yes, it was.
3	MR. MCKEON: I didn't notice that in the
4	file jacket.
5	MR. BASTIDA: I would have to find why,
6	but there are several ways to advertise. One is
7	sending notices to people within 200 foot, I mean, to
8	all the ANCs and making one notice.
9	MR. MCKEON: But when your regulations
10	require you to advertise in the newspaper, do you
11	MR. BASTIDA: Sir, that was actually
12	amended and it's since 1999, it's not required.
13	MR. MCKEON: Okay.
14	MR. BASTIDA: Okay?
15	MR. MCKEON: All right. And one thing I
16	want to add is if it were to apply, if you can't zone
17	NPS lands and they don't intend to apply it to
18	southwest, where is it going to apply, Parcel 169?
19	That's landlocked. Why put a W-0 Zone on 169?
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we got your
21	point.
22	MR. MCKEON: Okay. Thank you.
23	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, let me just
24	ask. I guess I may need to go sit down in there. The
25	exchanging was between you and Mr. Parsons. Now, I

have gotten confused, so I am going to ask that the corporation counsel expound on this on page 3 a little 2 3 bit more to us, so I can make sure I'm clear. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. That's 5 good. VICE CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 8 MS. RAUP: Madam Chairman, could I make 9 I am looking at these beautiful one last comment? 10 of the waterfront here that are being pictures 11 displayed, and the last picture that has a boat in it 12 and some waterfront isn't in D.C. 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 14 MS. MCKEON: Where is that? 15 MS. RAUP: Pardon me? 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: None of them are 17 we're being told. Although, the Cherry Blossoms look kind of familiar. 18 19 MS. RAUP: Yes. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And those ducks, I 21 have seen those ducks. Okay. Thank you. G.W. Sima, 22 Siwa, it looks like S-I-W-A or S-I-M-A. Okay. Sam 23 Sharkey, it sounds like a good name if you live on the water. I have an A. Donahue and a J. Donahue. 24

MS. DONAHUE: Janet Donahue, I will not be

speaking.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. John Goodrow, again another good name for the water, Goodrow, there you go. Good evening, Mr. Sharkey.

MR. SHARKEY: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How are you tonight?

MR. SHARKEY: Older.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Me, too, me, too.

MR. SHARKEY: I am the official old fogie of the club. I am only 88, so I got a little ways to go to reach puberty.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sure the girls are excited.

MR. SHARKEY: I'm going to be very brief.

I don't think I will go over what anybody else said.

That's why I threw away my manuscript. Last night I was counting as the Planning Board kept talking about access to the waterfront. They used that word. I stopped counting after they reached 50.

Now, they are going to put up a 12 story apartment house. They are putting up a couple of nine story buildings and a couple of five to six story buildings, and that is granting access when we now have two story buildings. That seems to be very, very contrary, and most of them are going to be apartment

houses. Can you imagine what the rent is going to be on a prime location like that? You're talking minimum \$3,000 for a one bedroom apartment.

That doesn't very much help the community, the old fashioned community we have had here that's been an integral part of the southwest, and I think that is very opposite to what should be done down there. I guess that's about all I can think of.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Sharkey. Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you. What I have left after what has been covered by so many other people, I have bits and pieces, so I will dive into them. The beginning of the presentation by Mr. Lawson, I believe, emphasized the value of trying to improve the waterfront recreational area for maritime purposes.

When you look at the maritime purposes in this area, it goes from canoes to mega-yachts. It isn't just sculling and it isn't just runabouts, 26 foot runabouts. There is a tremendous breadth of types of vessels that come in here. Many of them stay here.

However, the Capital Yacht Club is the host to the mega-yachts that come here to visit this city, both the diplomats and for the lobbyists and for

the wealthy and for the individuals who have decided to explore the world on their 60 or 70 foot yachts instead of the 150 to 200 foot yachts that we have coming in here.

We are charged, Capital Yacht Club is, we are charged with providing a recreational maritime facility for the District of Columbia. Our mission is to be the managers of all transient vessels coming into our yacht club. It is a lease that we have with the District of Columbia. It came out of the fact that we lost this land when we owned it for so many years. We lost it and then we had to fight to get it back.

It took us until two years ago to pay off the mortgages for the yacht club building that we had to put back in there after the last one was demolished by whatever terms you want to us, taking, eminent domain, whatever. So we have been subjected to this before, and we're very gun-shy about this whole thing. That's why so many people here are emphasizing whether or not W-O can be used against us, because it was before in another life.

We are also concerned that the people who hold our lease, the District of Columbia, it used to be the RLA, are the same ones who are now involved in

1	this comprehensive plan. What is it, the NCRC?
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
3	MR. DONAHUE: They hold our lease. They
4	have the prerogative to exercise whatever they choose
5	to do with your plan to move us out of there when they
6	feel like it. They can break that lease for their
7	benefit, and their benefit seems to be wrapped around
8	that very large comprehensive plan down there, which
9	as we have mentioned several times does not show the
10	Capital Yacht Club anywhere in the facility, in the
11	arena.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to wrap up
13	now, Mr. Donahue.
14	MR. DONAHUE: All right. So we're asking
15	you to consider the fact that we have a reason to be
15 16	
	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about
16	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about
16 17	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who
16 17 18	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while
16 17 18 19	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while we're just running a small yacht club.
16 17 18 19	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while we're just running a small yacht club.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And, Mr.
16 17 18 19 20 21	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while we're just running a small yacht club.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And, Mr. Goodrow, you seem to be from a different place, WCC?
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while we're just running a small yacht club.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And, Mr. Goodrow, you seem to be from a different place, WCC?  MR. GOODROW: Yes, the Washington Canoe
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	concerned, and it isn't just because we worry about the Planning Board. We worry about the developers who see multi billion dollars collecting down there while we're just running a small yacht club.  CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And, Mr. Goodrow, you seem to be from a different place, WCC?  MR. GOODROW: Yes, the Washington Canoe Club.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You will have five minutes if you need, if you would like.

MR. GOODROW: I don't think I need that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. GOODROW: And I also wish I was a proponent, not an opponent. First, I would like to say that I would like to have on the wording no exclusive use exemptions. The problem that I have is the same as Mr. Hannaham has, and that is I am not sure what a marina is and I am not sure what a boathouse is.

I was at Princeton and Princeton has a boathouse. I should say it has a boat mansion, a coach's quarter, assistant coach's quarters. It has a kitchen that can feed 100. It has an erg room, weight room, center room, steam room. So is it a boathouse, a spa, a restaurant or a residential house with a river view? Do you know what the definition is? My garage has a canoe in it. Do I park my car in my boathouse?

The next thing I would like to talk about is the 20 foot easement. I think the 20 foot easement for safety and security of the river is really important to maintain. I would like to see it increased. James Woodworth who came and talked about

the needs for a setback and protecting the river from runoff was convincing, and with a concept that the Department of, I guess it was, Interior has guidelines for such, I think we should actually look into that also.

I would also like to say that Washington is best known for its rivers and its parks, and I would like an easement also from the parks. When we give property to a private concern, I think we should have the public's right of way on the park protected. So I think we should have an easement from the park land to any type of building or construction that is being done on the property that is being given into private hands.

We met with the National Park Service in a very serious and inclusive discussion on their vision of the W-O and the Washington Canoe Club does support that W-O Zoning, and I would like to say that I am not sure after hearing that the National Park Service is going to keep in their records a perpetual covenant.

I am not sure what the perpetual covenant is, as opposed to a W-O Zoning. Does that mean that the zoning does not have to be done? That is basically all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank

1	you. Any questions? All right. Thank you,
2	gentlemen.
3	MR. GOODROW: Okay. Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there anyone else
5	who would like to testify? Anyone else who would like
6	to testify in opposition or at all?
7	MS. DeWEES: Can I just ask the Court,
8	just give my name and ask the Court?
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm sorry? Why don't
10	you come forward and just put your question on the
11	record?
12	MS. DeWEES: My name is Pam DeWees. I am
13	also a member of Capital Yacht Club. I have been
14	boating for 15 years. I just wanted to say that I
15	support the testimony given by Commodore Guy Nolan and
16	ANC Commissioner Ed Johnson.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Did you
18	fill out two witness cards?
19	MS. DeWEES: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Make sure the
21	reporter gets them. And, sir, what is your name?
22	MR. MILLER: My name is Chris Miller. I
23	am a member of the Capital Yacht Club also. I have
24	been a member for 11 years and had boats on and off
25	the water during that time. I gave some testimony

out. I won't bother to read it. I know you have heard most of it four times. So I just would like to make a couple of points for your consideration. They are relatively specific, I hope.

know, when your use changed. What concerns me a little bit, and maybe I am out of line here, but with the NCRC making changes to the environment, if they displace us, if they move us, if they give us another facility, I am afraid that that's going to trip some kind of a clock or a change clause in this zoning, which then would allow us to become subject to things we weren't subject to before. In other words, I understand that we are a continuing use, but that might change. I think some provision has to be, at least, it has to be thought of and some provision has to made for that.

Second, I would like to make sure that non boaters in the audience understand the difference between pleasure boats and business boats. You know, there are some people in the back that run business boats for hire and they certainly have certain regulations that are Coast Guard and District enforced, and they have what you would call, I guess, a Certificate of Occupancy for the boat, which is

perfectly appropriate.

Pleasure boats don't have that. Pleasure boats dock, which most of us in the yacht club have. Pleasure boats dock at a dock and we use that dock as, essentially, a place to tie up. We don't get a Certificate of Occupancy. We have never gotten a Certificate of Occupancy. I don't believe there would be a way to use a Certificate of Occupancy.

So any regulation that zoning puts out must take that difference into consideration. We can't write language around COs, because it's not going to work. Now, certainly, the club can have a CO. That's a different issue.

Third, as we have made many, many times the point tonight, we don't want this thing to apply to the southwest and everybody says it's not going to apply to the southwest and I gather for two reasons, one, because we're on federal land. Although, perhaps that could be changed, because whether we're a lease or a concession, I don't know how all that works, I'm not an attorney, and we have a good one working on that.

But I guess what I am saying is is why can't you put something in the law that says if you are at a higher density, you can't be downsized unless

you agree with it? I mean, we're at a relatively high density in the southwest now. Whatever that equivalent is, I don't know. We don't want people coming in there putting us at a W-O and taking our property away. So put some provision in there that says that can't happen. You know, just don't be allowed to downsize us unless we agree with it.

And lastly, and I don't mean to attack the Park Commission, but I do want to make a point. Somebody mentioned earlier about how well the Park Commission is going to handle the private lands. I don't know if you people understand how important it was when Tommy Long went out of business.

My boat, which is a 43 foot boat, moves at about eight miles an hour. If I haul that boat, I have got five to six hours down the water before I can get it pulled out. Now, you talk about pollution, you talk about safety issues, I can't get that boat out of the water.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to wrap it up now, Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: Okay. Sorry, I didn't realize I did my three. So all my point is is that we need to have responsive facilities here that can react to those kinds of things. We were promised to Tommy

Long awhile ago. We don't have it yet. I don't think 2 we need to put more authority into that. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Just hold your seat. 5 MR. MILLER: Yes, ma'am. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 6 And I am assuming 7 you're Ms. McKay? 8 MS. McKAY: Yes. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 10 MS. McKAY: I am a member of Capital Yacht 11 Club and have been part of the waterfront community 12 for almost 10 years also at Gangplank Marina, as well. 13 I am also a teacher of English to adults from many 14 countries, and I don't know if -- I mean, there is 15 lots of words being thrown around tonight, but one of 16 the words you're going to keep hearing is transients, 17 and cruising transients are boaters that come in and 18 want a place to dock and they want to see the city, 19 and we give them that opportunity. 20 11 DCMR 917.1 proposes to stop yacht clubs 21 from renting slips to transients. Now, on the 22 Southwest Waterfront, the Capital Yacht Club is the 23 facility than can offer appropriate services to these Since the Gangplank is now under the

control of the NCRC, I am sure the NCRC would enjoy

transients.

24

increasing their revenues by picking up our transients, especially mega-yachts like Forbes and Eric Clapton as was mentioned earlier since we're name dropping.

However, the current lack of facilities and maintenance at Gangplank would be very discouraging to incoming transients, whether they are mega-yachts or small sailing vessels, unfortunately. I am a teacher. It's my job to be an ambassador every day I go in the classroom. My students see me as an American.

Many, many people come and dock at Capital Yacht Club and they see us as ambassadors. We open our doors. We welcome them to fun, food, lots of stuff. They come in. They enjoy using our computers. They enjoy using our bar facilities. They enjoy shooting darts, lots of things, and if we're not there, they're not coming.

We get thank you notes all the time to let us know that we are special ambassadors for the City of D.C. and the country. I have met people from all over the world sitting in the yacht club or walking along the waterfront that are docking in our facility. There is no valid reason in public policy to exclude Capital Yacht Club or any other yacht club from

1	welcoming transient vessels into our city and country
2	as we have done for a century.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
4	questions for these folks? All right. Thank you
5	both. Okay. Last call, anyone else? Okay. Mr.
6	Bastida, let's talk about dates to close the record.
7	MR. BASTIDA: Madam Chairman, what would
8	you like, two weeks or three weeks?
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let's say three.
10	Well, let's say two.
11	MR. BASTIDA: Okay.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Where is three going
13	to put us? Wait, let me see. What is three?
14	MR. BASTIDA: It would put it on Friday,
15	April 4 <sup>th</sup> .
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, that would be
17	fine.
18	MR. BASTIDA: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
20	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chairman, I
21	want to make a couple of remarks here.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
23	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I am very, very
24	troubled by tonight's hearing. It's, to me, a low
25	point in my tenure on this Commission, because the
- 1	1

error that we made in improper notice threatening certain areas of the city, or that's the way it was perceived, has set up the concern by so many folks here tonight that there is some hidden agenda here and there isn't.

And what we have turned this into is a group of very concerned people of the Capital Yacht Club, and I am very familiar with their history. They had a very difficult time in an urban renewal process of many years ago, and they think it's coming again, and they think we are some kind of cult that's going to help them with that, and I want them to know we aren't.

It's the National Capital Revitalization Corporation who is the one that is in charge of their future, and I cannot imagine that corporation or anybody associated with it that doesn't understand or appreciate what this yacht club has done for this waterfront. And to have them as a community, and that's what they are, feeling threatened is wrong. It's just wrong and I am going to do anything I can to stop it, because they need to be put to comfort, so that they will be productive in this community as they always have been instead of in this terrible state.

And I want to apologize to you. It's not

my fault, but I am going to help you, and it has nothing to do with zoning. It's just my care for them and what's going on in this planning process. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Parsons.

(Applause)

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: A good note to end on. I would like to thank you all for coming down and it's great to hear about your community. Living on a boat is not something I am familiar with, so it's really interesting to see all the folks and to hear about the community you have built down there.

As Mr. Bastida said, the record in this case will be closed on Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 p.m., so any additional information that you or your neighbors would like to submit, do so by that time. We will then make a decision on this case at one of our regular monthly meetings following the closing of the record.

These meetings are held at 1:30 p.m. on the second Monday of each month. Usually, that's the schedule, we occasionally change that, and they are open to the public, so you're invited to come back. If anyone is interested in following the case further,

you can contact Mr. Bastida to find out when the case will be on the agenda for decision making.

You should also be aware that should the Commission propose affirmative action, the proposed action must be published in the <u>D.C. Register</u> as a proposed rule making allowing a period of time for comments. In addition, the proposed rule making will be referred to the National Capital Planning Commission for federal impact review. Public hearing adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 9:52 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.)